DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 859 FL 003 193

AUTHOR	Orosz, Robert A.
TITLE	A Contrastive Analysis of English and Hungarian Grammatical Structure. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., Bloomington.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-E-036
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080036-3692-014
NOTE	336p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Analysis; Contrastive Linguistics; Descriptive Linguistics; *English; Grammar; *Hungarian; *Interference (Language Learning); Morphology (Languages); Nominals; Numbers; Pronouns; Second Language Learning; Semantics; Sentence Structure; *Structural Linguistics; Syntax; Time; Transformation Generative Grammar; Verbs

ABSTRACT

This study, contrasting grammatical structures in English and Hungarian, considers those areas of grammar in the two languages which would cause the greatest interference for the native English speaker learning Hungarian. The choice of topics is based on the author's personal observation, both of English speakers learning Hungarian and of Hungarian native speakers speaking English, and on a study of grammars of various kinds. The first part considers the article in general, and, in particular, the definite, indefinite, and zero article. Part 2 considers the category of definiteness, the definite article as a marker of definiteness, anaphoric and non-anaphoric definite personal pronouns, reflexive and demonstrative pronouns, the -ik pronouns and their English equivalents, indefinite pronouns, proper nouns, possessive constructions, and noun clauses. The third part involves morpho-syntax and considers such topics as sentence word order, interrogative and negative sentences, and phrasal verbs. Part 4 covers grammatical-semantic notions: time and tense usage, aspect, the category of number, and semantic considerations of number. References are listed. (VM)

BR 8E036

ED 061859

FL
OE-BR

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND HUNGARIAN GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE

by

ROBERT A. OROSZ, Ph. D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report For

U.S. Office of Education Contract No. OEC-0-8-080036-3692 (014)
Preparation of a Contrastive Grammar of English and Hungarian

FL003193

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 1

  0.1 The case for contrastive grammars 1
  0.2 Purpose and scope of this study 1
  0.3 The approach taken in this study 2
  0.4 Acknowledgements 3

PART ONE: ARTICLE USAGE 6

  CHAPTER I THE DEFINITE ARTICLE 8

    1.1 The definite article to indicate "previous mention" 8
      1.1.1 Partial subsequent reference 9
    1.2 The definite article to indicate "situational identification" 10
      1.2.1 Contrasts in situational identification ... 11
      1.2.2 Proximity 12
      1.2.3 Concurrent identification 12
    1.3 The definite article as a "generic article" 13
      1.3.1 Other generic articles in English 13
      1.3.2 Generics in non-definitional sentences 14
    1.4 The definite article in possessive constructions . 15
      1.4.1 Definite common noun as possessor 15
      1.4.2 Proper noun as possessor 16
      1.4.3 Possessive constructions without a noun ... 16
      1.4.4 Emphatic possessive constructions without a noun 17
      1.4.5 Definite article as a "possessive" in English 17
    1.5 The definite article with proper names 19
      1.5.1 The article as a regular part of the name . 19
      1.5.2 Interlingual contrasts in article usage with proper nouns 20
    1.6 Other uses of the definite article 20
      1.6.1 The definite article in English as part of a correlative conjunction 21
      1.6.2 The article with cited forms 21
      1.6.3 The definite article as part of an idiom .. 21
    NOTES TO CHAPTER I 23

  CHAPTER II THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE 24

    2.0 Introduction 24
    2.1 The introductory use of the indefinite article ... 24
      2.1.1 Alternates for introductory indefinite article 25
        2.1.1.1 Indefinite determiners 25
      2.1.2 Indefinite article with nouns used generically 26
        2.1.2.1 "Situational generic" usage 27
        2.1.2.2 Definitional generic usage 27
    2.2 Other uses of the indefinite article with common nouns 28

    2.2.1 Indefinite article to mark class-membership 29
        2.2.1.1 Indefinite article with qualified predicate nouns 30
        2.2.1.2 Emphatic qualified nouns with the indefinite article 30
    2.2.2 Indefinite article with expressions of time 30
        2.2.2.1 The indefinite article with general expressions of time 31
        2.2.2.2 The Hungarian article with other time units 31
2.3 The indefinite article used with a proper noun ...31
    2.3.1 Proper noun as "person named X" 32
        2.3.1.1 Unaccompanied indefinite article before name 33
        2.3.1.2 Emphasis on indefiniteness of name..33
    2.3.2 Proper name meaning "having the qualities of X" 34
    2.3.3 Optional use of article with modified proper noun 34
    2.3.4 Summary of indefinite article usage with "proper nouns" 35

CHAPTER III THE ZERO ARTICLE 37

3.0 Introduction 37
3.1 The zero article with common nouns 38
    3.1.1 Non-count-nouns 38
        3.1.1.1 Generic non-count-nouns 38
        3.1.1.2 Non-count-nouns as partitives 39
    3.1.2 Count-nouns 39
        3.1.2.1 "Classifying" nouns as predicates ..39
    3.1.3 Unspecified possessive 41
3.2 The zero article with proper nouns 41
    3.2.1 Zero with an unqualified proper noun 42
        3.2.1.1 Family name as collective 43
    3.2.2 Post-posed qualifiers in English personal names 43
    3.2.3 Place names with various qualifiers 44
NOTES TO CHAPTER III 46

PART TWO: THE CATEGORY OF DEFINITENESS 47
INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO 48
NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION TO PART II 54

CHAPTER IV THE DEFINITE ARTICLE AS A MARKER OF DEFINITENESS 55

4.0 Introduction 55
4.1 Previous mention in discourse 55
    4.1.1 Obligatory use of the definite article after previous mention 56
    4.1.2 Optional use of the definite article after previous mention 57
    4.1.3 Excluded use of the definite article after "previous mention" 58

4.1.4 Synonyms in previous mention 59
4.1.5 Definite noun phrases as part of previously-mentioned noun 60
4.2 Situational identification of noun phrases 61
4.3 Structural correlates of definitization as marked by definite article 62
4.3.1 Occurrence with non-restrictive clauses ...62
4.3.2 Partiality indicated by a non-restrictive clause 64
4.4 Structural correlates of definiteness in Hungarian 65
4.4.1 Co-occurrence of definite noun phrases with relative clauses 66
4.4.1.1 Different clause types as marked by pronouns in Hungarian 67
4.4.2 Definite conjugation with definite noun phrase objects 68
4.4.3 Contrasts in verb endings with definite and indefinite noun objects 68
4.4.4 The effect of word order on the use of the definite conjugation in Hungarian ...70
4.5 Summary of structural correlates of definitization 71
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV 73

CHAPTER V ANAPHORIC DEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS 75

5.0 Introduction 75
5.1 Anaphoric pronouns 76
5.1.1 Hungarian anaphoric pronouns or their substitutes as subjects 77
5.1.2 Hungarian total anaphoric pronouns or substitutes as direct objects 80
5.2 Contrasts in anaphoric pronoun usage 82
NOTES TO CHAPTER V 84

CHAPTER VI NON-ANAPHORIC DEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS 86

6.0 Introduction 86
6.1 English pronouns of the first and second person...86
6.2 First and "second" person pronouns in Hungarian...89
6.2.1 Familiar forms 90
6.2.1.1 Forms denoting "I subject - you object" 92
6.2.1.2 Possible deletions of first and second person object pronouns 94
6.2.2 "Formal" forms of address 95
6.2.2.1 Morphological considerations 96
6.2.2.2 Syntactic considerations 96
6.2.2.3 Sociological considerations for deletions 97
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI 99

CHAPTER VII REFLEXIVE AND DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS 100

7.0 Introduction 100
7.1 Reflexive pronouns 100

7.1.1 Anaphoric nature of reflexives 101
7.1.2 The definite nature of reflexive pronouns 102
7.2 Reflexive vs. reciprocal pronouns 104
7.3 Demonstrative pronouns 105
7.3.1 The deictic use 105
7.3.2 Anaphoric use 107
7.3.2.1 Total anaphoric demonstratives 107
7.3.2.1.1 Emphatic agreement with speaker 108
7.3.2.2 Demonstrative as partial-anaphoric pronoun 110
7.3.3 Demonstrative with restrictive modifiers. 111
7.3.3.1 Restrictive demonstratives as partitives 112
7.3.3.2 Restrictive demonstratives as independent indefinites 113
7.3.3.3 Demonstratives as possessive 114
7.3.4 Miscellaneous uses of the demonstrative forms 115
7.3.4.1 Demonstrative as derogatory personal pronoun 115
7.3.4.2 Other occurrences of English demonstratives 116
NOTES TO CHAPTER VII 117

CHAPTER VIII THE -IK PRONOUNS AND THEIR ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS 118

8.0 Introduction 118
8.1 Ordinal pronominals 120
8.2 Comparatives and superlatives in -ik 121
8.3 Possessive quantitative pronouns in Hungarian ...122
NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII 124

CHAPTER IX INDEFINITE PRONOUNS 125

9.0 Introduction 125
9.1 Independent indefinite pronouns 125
9.1.1 Independent indefiniteness vs. totality ..126
9.1.2 Independent indefinites vs. partitives ...127
9.2 Interrogative and relative pronouns 127
9.2.1 Independent interrogatives 128
9.2.2 Interrogative-relative pronouns 130
9.2.3 Relative pronouns 131
9.2.3.1 Personal reference with relative pronouns 132
9.2.3.1.1 Relative pronouns in non-restrictive clauses 132
9.2.3.1.2 Relatives in restrictive clauses 133
9.2.3.1.3 Hungarian personal relatives vs. determiner patterns ..135
9.2.3.1.4 Status of definiteness of Hungarian relative pronouns 136
9.2.3.1.5 The definite relative amelyik 138

9.2.3.2 Concrete non-personal reference with relative pronouns 140
9.3 Summary of the status of pronouns in the category of definiteness 142
NOTES TO CHAPTER IX 143

CHAPTER X PROPER NOUNS 144

10.0 Introduction 144
10.1 Determiners with "proper nouns" 144
10.1.1 The determiner as part of the name 145
10.1.2 Syntactically-determined use of determiners with proper nouns 148
10.1.2.1 Personal names qualified 149
10.1.2.2 Place names qualified 151
10.1.3 The status of definiteness of qualified proper nouns 154
10.2 "Proper names" as common nouns 156
10.2.1 Reduced proper name meaning "person or thing having the name X" 156
10.2.2 Reduced proper name meaning "person or thing having the qualities of X" 158
10.3 The status of proper nouns in the category of definiteness 160
10.3.1 Proper nouns as definites 160
10.3.1.1 Proper nouns and previous mention 161
10.3.1.2 Proper nouns and totality 162
10.3.1.3 Reduced proper nouns as definites 163
10.3.2 Real proper nouns and determiners 165
10.4 Improved definition of proper noun 166
10.4.1 The basic definition 166
10.4.2 Corollary one 166
10.4.3 Corollary two 167
NOTES TO CHAPTER X 168

CHAPTER XI POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS 169

11.0 Introduction 169
11.1 Situational identification of possessives 170
11.1.1 Totality vs. partiality of reference with possessives 171
11.1.2 Possessives marked with indefinite determiners 174
11.1.2.1 Indefinite determiners with possessives in English 175
11.1.2.2 Hungarian "indefinite" possessive patterns 175
11.2 Previous mention with possessive constructions .176
11.2.1 English introductory possessive constructions 177
11.2.2 Introductory possessive constructions in Hungarian 177
11.3 Possessive pronouns 179
11.4 Other pronouns with possessive suffixes in Hungarian 181
11.4.1 Quantitative pronouns with possessive suffixes 181

        11.4.2 Indefinite pronouns with possessive suffixes 183
    11.5 Summary of definiteness of possessives 185
    NOTES TO CHAPTER XI 186

CHAPTER XII NOUN CLAUSES 187

    12.0 Introduction 187
    12.1 Clause as subject of the main verb 187
        12.1.1 Noun clauses as subjects in English 188
        12.1.2 Noun clauses as subjects in Hungarian 190
    12.2 Noun clauses as objects 191
        12.2.1 Noun clauses as objects of verbs denoting a mental state 192
        12.2.2 Clauses as objects of verbs of reporting 194
    12.3 Other varieties of clause objects 199
        12.3.1 Desentential complement verbs in English 200
        12.3.2 Factitive verbs in Hungarian 203
            12.3.2.1 Pattern types with noun clauses 204
            12.3.2.2 Other pattern types 206
    NOTES TO CHAPTER XII 209

PART THREE: MORPHO-SYNTAX 210
INTRODUCTION TO PART THREE 211

CHAPTER XIII SENTENCE WORD ORDER 212

    13.0 Introduction 212
    13.1 Basic order 213
        13.1.1 Sentences with two elements 213
        13.1.2 Sentences with three or four elements 216
    13.2 Sentences with transitive verbs 216
        13.2.1 Sentences with intransitive verbs 217
        13.2.2 Sentences with copula 218
    13.3 Sentences with four elements 220
    NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII 222

CHAPTER XIV INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES 223

    14.0 Introduction 223
    14.1 Questions with interrogative words 223
    14.2 Yes-no questions 225
        14.2.1 Questions with inverted word order 226
        14.2.2 Questions with direct word order 227
        14.2.3 Questions with tag-words 228
    NOTES TO CHAPTER XIV 231

CHAPTER XV NEGATIVE SENTENCES 232

    15.0 Introduction 232
    15.1 Multiple negation 234
    15.2 Negative correlative conjunctions 237

CHAPTER XVI THE PHRASAL VERB 239

    16.0 Introduction 239
    16.1 Basic order of elements in the Hungarian phrasal verb 241

16.1.1 Preverbal position of adverbial element .242
16.1.1.1 Position immediately before the verb 243
16.1.1.2 Non-contiguous preverbal position 244
16.1.2 Postverbal position of the adverbial element 246
16.1.2.1 Position in negative sentences ...246
16.1.2.2 Position after other stressed elements in the sentence 247
16.2 Syntax of the Hungarian phrasal verb in emotionally emphatic sentences 248
16.2.1 Emphatic negative sentences 249
16.2.2 Emphatic imperatives 250
16.3 Reduplication of particles in phrasal verbs 251
16.3.1 Intensification expressed by "double prefixes" 252
16.3.2 Reduplicated particle as frequentative marker 252
16.4 Preverbs in elliptical responses to yes-no questions 253
16.4.1 Elision of predicate in response 254
16.4.2 Phrasal-verb predicate as response 255
16.4.3 Negative responses with phrasal verb 256
16.4.4 Affirmative responses to negative questions 256
16.5 Example of literary use of phrasal verb 257
NOTES TO CHAPTER XVI 258

PART FOUR: GRAMMATICAL-SEMANTIC NOTIONS 259
INTRODUCTION TO PART FOUR 260

CHAPTER XVII TIME AND TENSE USAGE 261

17.0 Introduction 261
17.1 Simple tense forms 262
17.1.1 "Present tense" usage in English and Hungarian 262
17.1.1.1 "Present tense" to designate past events 263
17.1.1.2 "Present tense" to indicate on-going events 264
17.1.1.2.1 Hungarian simple present vs. other forms in English 266
17.1.1.3 Simple "present" to indicate future events 267
17.1.2 Simple past tense 270
17.1.2.1 Simple past in Hungarian vs. present perfect in English 271
17.2 Composite tense forms 274
17.2.1 The periphrastic futures in English and Hungarian 275
17.2.1.1 The periphrastic future as a polite request in English 277
17.2.2 Other composite verb forms in Hungarian .278
17.2.2.1 The conditional perfect 279

17.2.2.2 The szoktam + infinitive construction .280
NOTES TO CHAPTER XVII 282

CHAPTER XVIII ASPECT 283

18.0 Introduction 283
18.1 The continuous tenses in English 284
  18.1.1 Present-time relations as expressed by the continuous tenses 284
  18.1.2 Past-time relations as expressed by continuous tenses 287
  18.1.3 The continuous tenses to express future time 290
18.2 Sequence of tenses 291
  18.2.1 Time indications of English tenses 291
  18.2.2 Sequence of tenses in indirect speech ...294
18.3 Statal passive 297
  18.3.1 Statal passive vs. real passive 297
  18.3.2 Statal passive constructions compared ...298
  18.3.3 "Reflexive verbs" vs. passives in Hungarian 299
NOTES TO CHAPTER XVIII 301

CHAPTER XIX THE CATEGORY OF NUMBER 302

19.0 Introduction 302
19.1 Pluralization 302
  19.1.1 Non-possessive nominals 302
    19.1.1.1 Plural determiners 304
  19.1.2 Possessive nouns 305
    19.1.2.1 Semantic interpretation of plural possessives 307
19.2 Agreement in number 308
  19.2.1 Agreement of verbal predicate 309
    19.2.1.1 Agreement with conjoined subjects 310
  19.2.2 Agreement of predicate adjectives and nouns 311
    19.2.2.1 Predicate adjectives 311
    19.2.2.2 Predicate nouns 313

CHAPTER XX SEMANTIC CONSIDERATIONS OF NUMBER 315

20.0 Introduction 315
20.1 Count-noun vs. non-count-noun 315
  20.1.1 Mass vs. individual object 316
    20.1.1.1 Alternations between mass and object 318
  20.1.2 Body parts as viewed for number 319
    20.1.2.1 Paired body parts 320
  20.1.3 Appendages for paired body parts 321
20.2 English plurals vs. Hungarian singulars with "paired objects" 321
  20.2.1 "Paired" items of clothing 322
  20.2.2 "Paired" tools in English 322
20.3 General problems of number 323

REFERENCES 324

PREFACE

0.1 The case for contrastive grammars

The case for contrastive grammars based on sound descriptive analyses of the two languages in question has been succintly and effectively stated by Charles A. Ferguson (Stockwell et al. 1965:v.): " ... one of the major problems in the learning of a second language is the interference caused by the structural differences between the native language of the learner and the second language. ... a careful contrastive analysis of the two languages offers an excellent basis for the preparation of instructional materials, the planning of courses, and the development of actual classroom techniques."

In addition to the above uses, such a contrastive grammar can prove useful in itself for advanced students of either language who could improve their control of the second language by getting rid of subconscious "foreignisms" more rapidly and effectively, having had their attention directed to these structural faults. A contrastive grammar may also be of interest to linguists, who may find it convenient to have juxtaposed analyses of the given languages, for example, in the search for linguistic universals. Finally, I might state my agreement with the opinion that contrastive studies "are viable objectives for their own sake." (Stockwell 1968:25.)

0.2 Purpose and scope of this study

The purpose of this study is to contrast from the structural linguistic point of view those areas of English and Hungarian grammar which in my view are most likely to cause the greatest interference for the native English speaker learning Hungarian. Since the development of contrastive grammars as such is in its infancy, there are as yet no quantitative measures that can be applied to the grammars of two given languages to determine those differences of structure in which the greatest likelihood of interference would arise. The choice of topics here has, accordingly, been based, for the most part, on personal observation, both of English speakers learning Hungarian and of Hungarian native speakers speaking English, and on a study of grammars of various kinds, both in English and Hungarian. Since a "complete" grammar of any language would be virtually impossible--from the practical--and, possibly, even the linguistic--point of view, this study will be limited in scope, treating selected areas, primarily of syntax, and secondarily of morphology. (For a contrastive study of English and Hungarian phonology see Nemser and Juhasz 1964.)

0.3 The approach taken in this study

The approach taken in this study is essentially taxonomic. However, there are also several statements of the transformational-generative type made here, but only of the most informal variety. Strict limitations on space precluded the insertion of more formal generative statements, and also the inclusion of a greater number of "intermediate" stages of some of the structures discussed here. The examples for both of the languages treated are given in the traditional orthographies. However, since this work is not intended for use by beginning students of either English or Hungarian, the number of examples is kept at the minimum necessary for the proper illustration of the given principle being analyzed. Moreover, spacial limitations also preclude giving overt "hints to the teacher" or a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of each example, although such devices would undoubtedly be of practical value for some readers. It is assumed, however, that the examples as given, translated, and discussed here will serve their intended purpose of illustration.

0.4 Acknowledgements

The English corpus represents, first of all, my own speech, a spoken variety of standard "mid-Western American," supplemented by the opinions of other native speakers of more or less the same variety of American English. Unfortunately, no native speaker of British English was available to me at the most crucial stages of the preparation of this study; consequently, interesting aspects of that variety of English had to be left out of consideration. Published studies were also used as sources for some of the English material used. Direct quotations from these works are indicated in the footnotes, and my gratitude to these authors, if not noted elsewhere, is hereby acknowledged, as is my gratitude to those native speakers of American English, too numerous to list, who have at one time or other been kind enough to answer questions relating to usage. Special thanks are due Kathleen Fenton and Cathy Orosz for graciously taking time out from busy schedules to answer some of my queries. I have also profited from several linguistic discussions held with Rex Moser and with Craig Goodrich.

The uncited Hungarian material used for this study was collected partly during the course of a three-year program of Hungarian studies at Indiana University made possible through NDEA

Foreign Language Fellowships, partly during a six-month stay in Hungary which was financed by a grant from the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, and partly during the period of this contract with the United States Office of Education. I wish to thank all of the organizations involved as well as Professor Thomas A. Sebeok, who very kindly made available to me the facilities of the Indiana University Research Center for the Language Sciences.

For assistance in certain matters pertaining to usage in Hungarian I am indebted to Professor Gustav Bayerle and Dr. Andrew Vázsonyi of Indiana University, and to my regular native informant here in the U.S., Mr. László Kovács. For help during my stay in Hungary I am especially indebted to Dr. János Zsilka, Dr. József Erdődi, Mr. Gábor Vigh, and other individuals who offered advice--often unsolicited--in matters pertaining to the Hungarian language.

Professors Alo Raun and Fred Householder of Indiana University offered valuable suggestions in regard to some of the material presented in this study, in particular Part II, which was submitted as a doctoral dissertation to the faculty of the Graduate School of Indiana University and accepted in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Linguistics.

Many useful suggestions were also offered by Professor Carleton Hodge, to whom I owe an especial debt of gratitude, for without his kind efforts this project would not have been initiated.

Needless to say, any deficiencies in this work are my sole responsibility.

Édes szüleim emlékének

PART ONE: ARTICLE USAGE

In foreign-language textbooks written in English it seems traditional to begin the section on "grammar" with the presentation of the equivalents of the English definite article, if such exists in the language studied. This practice is pedagogically understandable when one considers the high frequency of the articles in a running text of English. One would, accordingly, expect an English-speaking student of a foreign language to feel an immediate need to know what the translation equivalents of the articles are in the language being studied, inasmuch as he is immediately called on to produce the equivalent of "I am a student," or "Miss Smith is the teacher," and the like.

There is a correspondingly strong motivation for beginning a contrastive grammar such as this with a detailed discussion of the different articles and their uses, especially when one of the languages being analyzed is Hungarian, a language in which the articles play just as important a role as the articles in English. In Hungarian, moreover, article selection is not only syntactically important in itself, as in English, but also has a direct bearing on the selection of either of two main conjugation types.

Structurally speaking, there are three articles (with several allomorphic variants) in Hungarian, and three--possibly four--in English, also with several variants each. The articles in English are *the*, *a/an*, *Ø*, (and possibly *no*); for Hungarian *a/az*, *egy*. In this work English *the* and Hungarian *az* will represent all forms of the "definite article," and English *a* and Hungarian *egy* all forms of the respective "indefinite article," regardless of the particular variant present in the given examples. The third article to be discussed extensively in this section is Ø, which, since it has no phonemic value nor graphemic representation, is generally ignored in traditional grammars of either language. In modern linguistic literature Ø is called the "zero determiner" or simple "zero." In this study "zero article" will be used as a parallel term to "definite" and "indefinite articles," and in free variation with the preceding labels.

CHAPTER I

THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The uses of the definite article in English and Hungarian seem at first glance to be so similar that it may be safe to assume that interference can be caused by this very fact alone. The principle of least effort could understandably lead a beginning English-speaking student to use the Hungarian articles everywhere in the same fashion as the English ones as soon as he discovers that their basic "meanings" are quite similar. Any significant divergence in usage may escape his notice until special effort is made on his part to scrutinize the differences whenever they occur in the structures being studied. A survey such as the following might result from such a scrutiny.

1.1 The definite article to indicate "previous mention"

Perhaps the principal use of the definite article in both languages is to mark a noun as having been previously identified. This identification may stem from previous mention in the discourse or from the situation in which the discourse is taking place. Thus, the definite article signals the fact that the noun it appears with is the "same" noun that was just mentioned in prior discourse:

a. 1. I met an interesting man yesterday. The man ...
2. Egy érdekes férfit ismertem meg tegnap.
A férfi ...

In these typical discourse situations we have an example of the indefinite article in each language being used to mark the introduction of a noun into a discourse, and the subsequent use of the definite article to mark the noun as having been previously identified. In fact, it could by convention be considered "ungrammatical" to continue the discourse in either language using the indefinite article in the second sentence if the speaker expects the hearer to understand that the identical man is meant in both occurrences of the noun.

1.1.1 Partial subsequent reference. If a noun introduced into a discourse by an indefinite determiner has a plural or collective referent, the subsequent occurrence of the definite noun may vary in patterning in either language, depending on whether all or part of the entities underlying the antecedent are subsequently being referred to. This factor, namely total vs. partial reference, has extensive structural ramifications in several areas of syntax in both Hungarian and English--and will be treated in detail in Part II of this study. In this section we will deal with the effect this factor has on the use of the articles. It is well known that a singular noun phrase, once having been mentioned, may be marked by the definite article in English and also by the fact that such a definite noun phrase may be followed by non-restrictive modification only, such as a clause, as in the following example:

a. 1. I met an interesting man yesterday.[1]
   2. The man, who was very intelligent, told me many interesting things.
   3. *The man who was very intelligent told me many interesting things.

Since there is only one entity underlying the antecedent of the man in a.2, the reference here must necessarily be total. If, on the other hand, there is a plural or collective antecedent involved, the subsequent reference may be total or partial. If total in reference, the definite noun phrase may be followed by non-restrictive modification; if partial, then a new noun phrase must be formed by adding the necessary restrictive modification to the definite noun:

b. 1. I met a group of men yesterday.
(all) 2. The men, who were intelligent, were very interesting.
(some) 3. The men who were intelligent were very interesting.

In Hungarian there seems to be no regular phonemic difference between restrictive clause types. Accordingly, the above sort of distinction must be made elsewhere in the sentence. This is usually done by the employment of a different determiner, as is shown in the following translations of the sentences in b.

c. 1. Egy csoport férfit ismertem meg tegnap.
(all) 2. A férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.
(some) 3. Azok a férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.

It goes without saying that other types of restrictive modification may also be employed when only part of the original group is being referred to subsequently, for example, stressed preposed adjectives:

d. 1. The intelligent men were interesting.
2. Az intelligens férfiak érdekesek is voltak.

Except for the fact that predicate adjectives are declined for number in Hungarian, the various modifications possible as alternates for those shown in b. and c. above match quite closely from one language to the next.

1.2 The definite article to indicate "situational identification"

It will be readily understood that often the identification needed for definitizing a noun may actually come through tacit agreement rather than overt discourse, for in countless instances in human affairs the situation itself in which the discourse is taking place provides sufficient identification for both the speaker and hearer to understand what the "real world" referent of the particular noun is. Thus we can say:

a. 1. Please close the window.
   2. Tessék az ablakot becsukni.

b. 1. Please close the door.
   2. Zárja be az ajtót, kérem.

without having to say overtly something to the effect that there is an open window near the hearer, or that the door to the room is open. As these examples show, this applies to the Hungarian situation as well as to the English. The situation in which a noun may thus be tacitly identified may range from rather narrow confines, as, for example, the room in which the discourse is taking place--as in the examples in the preceding paragraph--to the whole world of human comprehension.

1.2.1 *Contrasts in situational identification.* While the two languages being discussed here generally agree in the use of the definite article with situationally-identified common nouns, there are naturally areas of contrast in this broad area. One such point of contrast lies in the interpretation of the status of the names of the days of the week and of the months. These of course are treated as proper nouns in English, both as to orthography and syntax, but as common nouns in Hungarian with the definite article being optional:

a. 1. Tuesday isn't suitable for me.
   2. (*A*) kedd nem alkalmas nekem.

b. 1. Where did March go?
   2. Hova ment (*a*) március?

When modified, such names in English are reduced to ordinary common nouns capable of collocating with either definite or indefinite determiners: *on a beautiful Sunday, on the following Tuesday*, which parallels *on a cold day* and *on the following day*.

1.2.2 *Proximity*. The above-mentioned notion of "situational identification" has in it some notion of "proximity," primarily spacial in English, both spacial or temporal in Hungarian. Thus, while the definite article in both languages is used to indicate "the ___ near you," e.g., "window" and "door" in 1.2 above, the same article in Hungarian may indicate some "time near us," for example, *az aste* 'last night', *a héten* 'this week,' *a napokban*, lit. 'in the days' = 'recently,' etc. English follows this usage somewhat inconsistently, unless one can say that *the past, the present*, and *the future* are equally "proximate" in the minds of mortal English speakers. With the names of the seasons, however, the definite article does seem to convey the idea of proximity in English for some speakers. The contrast between a.1 and a.2 below is one of differentiating between "every spring" in a.1 and "the coming spring" in the other sentence:

a. 1. In *spring* we move to Missesota.
   2. In *the spring* we move to Minnesota.

The Hungarian equivalents can make the same type of semantic distinction by the use of different auxiliary verbs:

b. 1. Tavasszal Minnisotába *szoktunk* költözni.
      (i.e. "usually")
   2. Tavasszal Minnisotába *fogunk* költözni.
      ('will')

1.2.3 *Concurrent identification*. We may finish this section of our discussion on the uses of the definite article by mentioning an obvious, but important fact: "previous mention" is very often actually "concurrent mention," that is, the identification of the noun phrase may occur in the same sentence as the noun phrase in question:

a. 1. The story I am about to tell ...
   2. A történet, amelyet most elmesélek ...

More will be said of this phenomenon in the discussion of definiteness in Chapter IV.

1.3 *The definite article as a "generic article"*

The definite article in both languages can be used with a noun taken in the generic sense. This may be considered to be a type of "situational identification." When the generic noun is a count-noun and is employed in a definitional sentence, the generic article usage is the same:

a. 1. *The whale* is a mammal.
   2. *A bálna* emlősállat.

However, if the nouns in question are non-count nouns, zero is used in English, while the Hungarian article is the same:

b. 1. *Sugar* is a popular flavoring.
   2. *A cukor* népszerű ízesítő.

c. 1. *Gold* is a precious metal.
   2. *Az arany* nemesfém.

d. 1. *Patience* is a virtue.
   2. *A türelmesség* erény.

The noun *man* used generically also appears with zero in English, while its Hungarian equivalent has the expected definite article:

e. 1. *Man* is also a mammal.
   2. *Az ember* is emlősállat.

1.3.1 *Other generic articles in English.* *The* is not the only article which is used with generic count-nouns in English definitional sentences. The indefinite article, as well as zero with plural nouns may be so used, while Hungarian uses only *az*. Thus, the three English sentences below are all generic statements and have only one acceptable Hungarian equivalent:

a. 1. The whale is a mammal.
2. A whale is a mammal.
3. Whales are mammals.

b. 1. A bálna emlősállat.
2. *Egy bálna emlősállat.
3. *Bálnák emlősállatok.

1.3.2 *Generics in non-definitional sentences.* When a generically used noun occurs in a non-definitional sentence, article usage may vary from that above. In a sentence such as a.1 below, for example, *the* + noun cannot be used to convey the same general non-contrastive meaning, while in Hungarian the generic noun may occur in the plural, but again with the definite article:

a. 1. I don't like cats. (*the cat(s))
2. Nem szeretem a macskát. (sg.)
or: 3. Nem szeretem a macskákat. (pl.)

The generic pattern of the English noun phrase in a.1 coincides with the pattern of non-count nouns occurring either in a generic or partitive sense. In Hungarian these uses are kept separate, the definite article occurring in the first instance, zero in the second:

b. 1. I like coffee. (generic)
2. Szeretem *a* kávét.

c. 1. I'd like coffee. (non-generic)
2. Kávét szeretnék.

The contrasting uses of the different sets of conjugational endings in Hungarian will be discussed in Part II of this study.

1.4 The definite article in possessive constructions

The use of the definite article in possessive constructions in both languages shows several structural parallelisms, but many divergencies as well.[2] When the possessor noun, for example, appears as an overt part of the possessive construction, the possibilities in both languages are varied. Both Hungarian and English may have two, one, or no occurrences of the definite article, there being, of course, no one-to-one correspondence between the uses of articles and all other structural factors involved in the possessive construction.

1.4.1 Definite common noun as possessor.

When the possessor is a common noun made definite through previous mention or through situational identification, both languages agree in the use of the definite article before the possessor if the possessor is animate, the possessed being obligatorily preceded by *Ø* in English, while the corresponding Hungarian may have *Ø* or *az*:

a. 1. a fiú könyve
   2. the boy's book

If the possessor is inanimate, the Hungarian construction remains the same, while the English one generally varies:

b. 1. a ház teteje
   2. the roof of the house (*the house's roof)

The definite article in Hungarian is required between the possessor noun and the possessed if the former has the genitive suffix *-nak*:[3]

c. 1. a fiúnak *a* könyve
   2. the boy's book

d. 1. a háznak *a* teteje
   2. the roof of the house

While the two variants of the possessive construction in Hungarian are optional, showing only a slight difference in emphasis in the latter form, the distinction in English between animate and inanimate possessive patterns is fairly strictly upheld except for a number of temporal nouns: e.g., *a week's wages*, and a limited number of common nouns sometimes felt to have proper noun status: *the earth's rotation*, *the sun's rays* (also: *the rotation of the earth*, *the rays of the sun*,) etc.

1.4.2 *Proper noun as possessor*. When the possessor is a proper noun, both languages may have the zero article before the possessor and before the possessed:

a. 1. János könyve
   2. John's book (*the book of John)

However, with the possibility of using the definite article before a proper noun in colloquial Hungarian, two more constructions are possible:

b. 1. (a) János könyve
   2. (b) Jánosnak *a* könyve

All four variants have the same English equivalents in written form, stress placement being used to make any necessary distinctions of emphasis in speech.

1.4.3 *Possessive constructions without a noun*. When no noun is overtly present in the possessive construction, English uses the so-called *genitive articles* (*possessive adjectives*) to show the possessor-possessed relationship while Hungarian still employs possessive suffixes, but now with the addition of the definite article before the noun so marked:

a. 1. *a* kalapom
   2. my hat

b. 1. *a* kalapod, etc.
2. *your* hat, etc.

In fact the use of the article in this type of structure is more or less obligatory in spoken Hungarian, although it is optional in written styles, especially in sentence-initial position.

1.4.4 *Emphatic possessive constructions without a noun.* If the possessor is emphasized in a Hungarian construction in which the possessor noun is not overtly present, then the personal pronoun together with the definite article is employed before the possessed, while the emphasis in the corresponding English construction is usually achieved by stress placement alone:

a. 1. *az én* kalapom, *a te* kalapod, etc.
2. *my* hat, *your* hat, etc.

The definite article is likewise used before the possessive pronoun in Hungarian:

b. 1. *az én* kalapom, nem *a tied*
2. *my* hat, not *yours*

1.4.5 *Definite article as a "possessive" in English.* In addition to the article usage mentioned above, English uses the definite article *instead of* the genitive article in certain constructions of a limited type, while the Hungarian equivalent generally retains the basic possessive pattern (particularly if the thing "possessed" is emphasized) with the definite article most often present. The latter construction in English may, I believe, also be analyzed as a (restricted) subcategory of the use of the definite article with a situationally identified noun, for in such sentences as the following the possessor of the body part is clearly understood from the immediate context:

a. 1. He has a pain in the stomach. (also: His stomach hurts.)
2. Fáj a gyomra.

b. 1. He was foaming at the mouth.
2. Habzott a szája.

That this is a structurally limited use of the English article is clear, but it is, nonetheless, an important aspect of accepted usage at all levels. While the equivalent construction in Hungarian calls for the use of the possessive noun in most cases--with or without the definite article--the use of the English "possessive" pattern being discussed here seems to rely on the fulfillment of two conditions: 1) the possessor of the body part (or article of clothing) is overtly expressed in the sentence, and 2) the possessed part or object is generally the object of a preposition. Therefore we can have:

a. 1. John scratched himself on the arm.
but not: 2. *John scratched himself on his arm.

b. 1. The apple hit him on the head.
but not: 2. *The apple hit him on his head.

We must also have:

c. 1. John raised his arm.
and not: 2. *John raised the arm.

also: d. 1. The apple fell on his head.
and not: 2. *The apple fell on the head.

if we mean that these particular body parts are on John and not detached. In short, then, if either of the above conditions has not been met, then the definite article is usually not used in this fashion. However, there is an exceptional pattern here which indicates "the part of a part" as in "the hair of his head," "the nail of/on his big toe," etc. Here only condition 1) is met.

1.5 The definite article with proper names

Although much more will be said in subsequent chapters on the use of various articles with proper nouns, it may be useful at this point to point out that the definite article in both English and Hungarian may collocate with proper nouns in at least two circumstances: 1) as an integral part of the name, or 2) as a non-contrastive (often optional) marker of a qualified proper noun. In addition, Hungarian personal names, both first names and full names, can be preceded by an optional definite article. We shall discuss circumstance 1) here, and defer the discussion of 2) until Chapter VII.

1.5.1 The article as a regular part of the name. English and Hungarian generally agree on the use of the definite article in names for geographical entities except that Hungarian is consistent in using the articles for all bodies of water, names of mountains, and heavenly bodies, while English makes an exception for the names of lakes, individual peaks, and the names of the planets. Thus we have, for example:

az Atlanti-óceán	the Atlantic (Ocean)
a Duna	the Danube (River)
but: a Balaton	Lake Balaton

It can be seen from the first two English examples above that the definite article with the name of the ocean or river name is usually sufficient as an unambiguous designation of the body of water in question. In such cases the may contrast directly with zero:

a. 1. I don't like the Mississippi.
2. I don't like Mississippi. (the state)

We also have:

	az Alpok	*the* Alps
but:	*a* Gellért Hegy	Gellert Hill (but: *the* Matterhorn)
and	*a* Föld (also *a föld*)	*the* Earth (also *Earth* and *the earth*)
but:	*a* Vénus, *a* Mars, etc.	Venus, Mars, etc.

1.5.2 *Interlingual contrasts in article usage with proper nouns*. Interlingual contrasts in article usage may be slightly more haphazard than the types listed in the preceding section, for discrepancies in the matching of articles can occur through intra-lingual optional usage or through competing forms. Thus in addition to the first two "lexical mismatches" given below, there are optional variants in one language not matched by parallel variants in the other language:

a Nagy-Britannia	Great Britain
Hága	*the* Hague (also *The Hague*)
Argentína	Argentina/*the* Argentine
az Egyesült Államok	*the* United States (*United States*, *these United States*)

The definite article may optionally occur before unqualified personal names in colloquial Hungarian:

(*a*) János	John
(*a*) Kovács Pista	Steve Smith
(*a*) Zsuzsi	Susie

while qualified personal names are regularily preceded by the definite article, optionally in English:

a kis Zsuzsi	little Susie
a hallgatag Kovács Pista	(*the*) silent Steve Smith

More on the modification of proper names will be found in Chapter VII.

1.6 *Other uses of the definite article*

There are other marginal (or miscellaneous) uses of the definite article in either language which have no counterparts in the other language. Some of these constructions may be classified as unanalyzable idioms, while others are productive, though statistically minor, constructions.

1.6.1 The definite article in English as part of a correlative conjunction. In English the definite article may occur in pairs with the comparative to form a correlative conjunction connecting the condition and result of an action. This is a type of "if ... then" relationship:

a. 1. the taller the better
   2. minél magasabb, annál jobb

b. 1. The more he talked, the stupider he sounded.
   2. Minél többet beszélt, annál butábbnak hallatszott.

1.6.2. The article with cited forms. Words cited as linguistic units must have the article in Hungarian, often in conjunction with the word szó 'word' or a compound of it. In English, on the other hand, the word may readily appear isolated:

a. 1. a "hogy" kötőszó
   2. the conjunction "hogy" (or, with different juncture: "hogy" is a conjunction)

b. 1. a szó "hogy" kötőszó
   2. "hogy" is a conjunction (or the word "hogy" is a conjunction)

c. 1. a "who" kérdő névmás
   2. the interrogative pronoun "who" (or "who" is an interrogative pronoun)

1.6.3 The definite article as part of an idiom. There are in English and Hungarian many expressions, acting as one lexical unit--though composed of more than one word--which, as such, are not analyzable into smaller meaningful units, but must be treated as wholes. As these idioms must necessarily be translated by similar or parallel whole semantic items, there may or may not be agreement as to occurrence of any given type of constituent, including, of course, the definite article. The following is a sample list of English idiomatic expressions in which the definite article is found. A possible Hungarian equivalent is given, the presence or absence of the definite article being governed by pure chance. The list could quite easily be expanded to monograph proportions:[5]

a. 1. at *the* time
   2. akkor (also: abban *az* időben)

b. 1. in *the* know
   2. jól értesült

c. 1. in *the* open
   2. a szabad ég alatt

d. 1. gild *the* lily
   2. *a* szépet szebbé tenni

e. 1. kick *the* bucket
   2. beadja *a* kulcsot

f. 1. be all *the* rage
   2. ez *a* legújabb divat

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. The convention of setting off non-restrictive clauses by commas to reflect the phonemic open juncture of speech will be followed here, as will the practice of marking unacceptable constructions with an asterisk (*).

2. See footnote 1 of Chapter IX for the structural definition of possessive construction as used here.

3. For the sake of simplicity I have chosen to give the back vowel variant of those suffixes which have vowel harmonic variants. Statements regarding the uses of a suffix, therefore, are to be understood to include all allomorphs, unless stated otherwise.

4. There are, however, several fixed expressions involving the designation of some part of the body which do not employ the possessive suffixes in Hungarian, and which usually occur without the definite article before the noun involved: fejbe vágni/kólint 'hit (someone) in the face,' arcon/pofon vágni 'slap (someone) in the face,' fülig 'up to the ear(s),' nyakig 'up to the neck,' etc. These Hungarian expressions, like their English counterparts, are quite frequent.

5. In addition to the many idioms found throughout the Országh dictionaries listed in the bibliography, there are several longer lists of English idioms with Hungarian equivalents available in print. See, for example, Kundt 1957 and Magay and Lukácsné 1966 and the bibliography given in the latter (p.5). These are miscellaneous lists of idioms, but it is remarkable how many of the idioms listed in the two named works contain at least one occurrence of the definite article in English at least.

CHAPTER II

THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE

2.0 *Introduction*

After the above rather lengthy discussion on the uses of the definite article in English and Hungarian, an analysis of the constructions with the indefinite article could almost be conducted by the process of elimination were it not for the existence of the zero article and of several co-occurrence restrictions to be explicated below. Therefore, the temptation to oversimplify by holding to a strict dichotomy of definite-indefinite, that is, maintaining that whatever structure is not definite is then indefinite, must be overcome, and each structure must be viewed in its own context. It is only then that the full relationships between different structures can be noted. With these admonitions in mind, we may now proceed to a fuller examination of various occurrences of *Ø* in Chapter III, although no matter which article is being discussed at one given time, each article must in effect be compared or contrasted to each of the others at more than one place.

2.1 *The introductory use of the indefinite article*

In both languages the indefinite article is employed to introduce a singular, countable noun phrase which has not been previously mentioned in the prior discourse or which is not situationally identifiable:

a. 1. *Egy* kocsi elakadt.
   2. *A* car broke down.

b. 1. A padon alszik *egy* ember.
   2. *A* man is sleeping on the bench.

As is well known, and as was indicated in 1.1 above, the indefinite article is, in a manner of speaking, ephemeral with a given noun phrase in a discourse, for, once having been used to introduce that noun phrase, it is subsequently replaced by the definite article or another definite determiner when further reference is made to the identical noun phrase in the same discourse.

2.1.1 Alternates for introductory indefinite article.

While the introductory use of the indefinite article in both languages seems to follow the very same pattern, it is not surprising to find that structural differences begin to emerge after only a minimum of further analysis. One area of difference lies in the type of determiner capable of replacing or alternating with the introductory indefinite article while preserving a maximum of the semantic features of the latter. If we consider the general "meaning" of the indefinite articles a and egy to be "unidentified individual" (of a certain class), then we can obviously postulate at least the minimum of two semantic features, namely "indefiniteness" and "singularity" and use these as a frame for testing the substitutability of other determiners.

2.1.1.1 Indefinite determiners.

To preserve or emphasize the feature of indefiniteness, both languages have recourse to a limited number of "indefinite" determiners which may be used in introductory situations in a discourse. These indefinite determiners may be categorized in close parallel to the two principal uses of the common indefinite articles a and egy, that is, the designation by the article may be of 1) a particular, but unidentified, member of a class, or 2) any member of that class. Examples of sentences containing an indefinite article of type 1) are:

a. 1. A man was sitting on the bench.
   2. Egy ember ült a padon.

b. 1. A teacher told me where to go.
   2. Egy tanár adta meg az útirányt.

These articles may be replaced, for example, by:

c. 1. Some man was sitting ...
   2. Valamilyen ember ült ...

or reinforced, for example, by:

d. 1. A certain teacher ...
   2. Egy bizonyos tanár ...

More will be said about usage 2) in 2.1.2 below. Accordingly, it need only be mentioned at this point that this English a may be replaced by any, while in Hungarian the definite article may play an important role in such a construction which may be construed as generic:

e. 1. A teacher shouldn't say such a thing. (i.e., any; *the)
   2. Egy tanár nem mondhat ilyesmit.
or 3. A tanár nem mondhat ilyesmit.

also: f. 1. Teachers shouldn't say such a thing.
   2. A tanárok nem mondhatnak ilyesmit.

The noun phrases a teacher and the teachers are quite obviously generic in some sense since they represent the whole class of teachers; consequently the Hungarian equivalents may contain the more common generic article az, as shown in e.3 and f.2, and as will be discussed in the following section.

2.1.2 Indefinite article with nouns used generically.

Both a in English and egy in Hungarian may be employed as "generic" articles in certain instances. The English indefinite article, however, is employed much more extensively in such constructions than is egy, which is limited to optional use in "situational generic" uses as indicated below.

2.1.2.1 "Situational generic" usage. English a and Hungarian egy are employed in "situational generic" cases where the noun phrase in question is indeed generic, that is, it represents the whole of its class, but reference is made to it in a specific situation. In terms of semantic features one may say that only some of the features of the noun phrase are considered pertinent to the given discourse situation. This is in contrast to "definitional generic" uses where all of the semantic features are being taken into consideration. The following examples are typical:

a. 1. Szegény volt mint egy koldus.
   2. He was poor as a beggar.

b. 1. Úgy áll a helyén, mint egy (or a) szikla.
   2. He's standing in his place like a rock.

c. 1. Egy (or a) tanár nem mondhat ilyet.
   2. A teacher shouldn't say such a thing.

As mentioned above, Hungarian may optionally use the definite article in such instances since the noun is taken in its generic sense. English, on the other hand, does not employ generic the in these cases, although, as we have seen, a and the may alternate in other generic uses, i.e., the definitional uses.

2.1.2.2 Definitional generic usage. In contrast to the situational generic use outlined above, there is another use of the English indefinite article which may be labelled here the "definitional generic" usage in which the definite generic article may also occur as an alternate. In such cases the

Hungarian uses only the definite article. An example of such a generic use of the indefinite article was given above in section 1.3.1:

a. 1. A whale is a mammal.

which was shown to have two alternates in English, but only one acceptable equivalent in Hungarian:

b. 1. The whale is a mammal.
   2. Whales are mammals.
   3. A bálna emlős(állat).

To complete this discussion of generic articles, it may be of interest to point out that while *a* covers all situational generic uses and only part of the definitional generic uses of the articles in English, there are also instances where *a* does not occur as a generic article if the noun in question is being stressed in its totality. This may be illustrated in the following sentences:

c. 1. Who invented *the* telephone? (**a*)
   2. Modern man exterminated *the* dodo. (**a*)

The Hungarian equivalent, of course, would contain the usual definite article as the generic article.

2.2 Other uses of the indefinite article with common nouns

The above discussion on the uses of the indefinite article in English and Hungarian covers the majority of cases where the two languages exploit the articles most fully, and where, coincidentally, the two languages most agree. There remain for discussion usages which may be called "minor," or types of usage in which the two languages diverge in structure to such an extent that the term "idiom" is appropriate. We will begin this part of our discussion with perhaps the most outstanding example of interlingual divergence in indefinite article usage, namely that of identification of class-membership in equational sentences.

2.2.1 *Indefinite article to mark class-membership.* As is well known, English, unlike many Indo-European languages, uses the indefinite article to identify the class to which a given entity belongs. In English this use of the article is obligatory whether or not the predicate noun in such an equational sentence is restricted or modified in any way. Standard Hungarian, on the other hand, follows the more prevalent Indo-European usage in leaving the predicate noun unmarked, or marked with zero in our discussion here, unless the noun is modified. The following examples may serve to illustrate this type of construction:

a. 1. The (A) sparrow is *a* bird.
   2. A veréb madár.

b. 1. My son is *a* doctor.
   2. A fiam orvos.

c. 1. John is *a* Catholic.
   2. János katolikus.

d. 1. That's *a* lie.
   2. Az hazugság.

e. 1. His friend is *an* American.
   2. A barátja amerikai.

In more informal Hungarian, however, one can find *egy* being used in much the same way as *a* of the English examples, this usage being labelled "fölöslegesen használva" ('redundant') in the *Értelmező Szótár* (Vol. II, p.38a.). The following sentences, then, are possible variants for the Hungarian examples immediately above:

f. 1. A veréb *egy* madár.
   2. A fiam *egy* orvos.
   3. János *egy* katolikus.
   4. Az *egy* hazugság.
   5. A baratja *egy* amerikai.

2.2.1.1 *Indefinite article with qualified predicate nouns.* When the predicate noun in an equational sentence is qualified, both languages agree in the use of the indefinite article. In this case, however, Hungarian has an optional construction with zero. So while Hungarian has zero as the rule before unmodified predicate nouns, as outlined in 2.2.1 above, and *egy* as an option, here *egy* is the general rule and zero the option:

a. 1. A veréb (*egy*) kis madár.
   2. The sparrow is *a* small bird.

b. 1. A fiam (*egy*) híres orvos.
   2. My son is *a* famous doctor.

2.2.1.2 *Emphatic qualified nouns with the indefinite article.* If a qualified noun with the indefinite article in Hungarian becomes a constituent of an emphatic sentence, then the qualifier may stand before the article. The corresponding English construction usually contains an intensifier before the article, which still precedes the original qualifier:

a. 1. Derék *egy* ember ez a Pista!
   2. This Steve is such *a* nice person.
      (What a nice person this Steve is!)

b. 1. Ostoba *egy* gyerek!
   2. Such *a* stupid child!

2.2.2 *Indefinite article with expressions of time.* Time expressions, which, as is well known, usually border on idiom, often contain occurrences of the indefinite in either language. Rather than present an exhaustive list of time expressions here, I believe it will serve a useful purpose merely to outline the types of construction in which the indefinite article may be employed in at least one of the languages being analyzed here. A more detailed discussion of time and tense will be presented in Chapter XVI.

2.2.2.1 *The indefinite article with general expressions of time.* In time expressions dealing with general designations of duration, as contrasted with countable units of time, both languages agree in the basic use of the indefinite article:

egy ideig	for *a* time
egy darabig	for *a* while

2.2.2.2 *The Hungarian article with other time units.* In cases where time expressions contain a measurable or countable unit, Hungarian may still employ the indefinite article before the time-designating element. Alternate usage (in addition to the best translation in English, as given here) seems to indicate that the article used in the Hungarian expressions displays the feature of singularity in this instance over the feature of indefiniteness. Thus the examples:

egy délután	*one* afternoon
egy vasárnap	*one* Sunday

may be replaced by

egyik délután	*one* afternoon
egyik vasárnap	*one* Sunday

particularly when the total number of such time units (out of which the particular entity has been selected for discussion) is known or understood in the discourse. The following example is illustrative (*Értelmező Szótár* II:50b.):

a. 1. Két hétig nyaraltam a Balatonon: *egyik* délután nagy vihar volt.
2. I spent two weeks on vacation on Lake Balaton. *One* afternoon there was a big storm.

2.3 *The indefinite article used with a proper noun*

We have seen in paragraph 1.5.2 that proper nouns in English may, under certain conditions, take a definite article which is not a permanent part of the name. This fact already shows that a characterization of proper nouns such as that given by Bloomfield: "Names (proper nouns) occur only in the singular number, take no determiner, and are always definite: John, Chicago" is inadequate on at least one account, namely that of non-occurrence with a determiner. In this section we shall see that the indefinite article may also occur with proper names, thereby invalidating the last portion of the above statement by Bloomfield. Although in Chapter VI we will discuss in detail the status of proper nouns in the category of definiteness, it may prove useful, by way of introduction, to discuss at least the following in regard to proper nouns and indefinite determiners. To begin our discussion, it is necessary to state, however, as Bloomfield himself does, that what seem to be proper nouns may, in effect, be reduced to common nouns in certain instances, and consequently may be employed with a preceding determiner, definite or indefinite. This point of view must be taken when one examines the various semantic differences between a proper noun with zero and one preceded by an indefinite article. This we shall do at the end of the following brief survey of some possible types of indefinite article and proper noun constructions.

2.3.1 Proper noun as "person named X." The indefinite article may precede a proper noun which has more or less the meaning "a person named ___," diverting attention from the individual to the name as such. In such cases the proper name can no longer be called "definite." There are, in fact, several degrees of "semantic" indefiniteness which can be achieved by the employment of various devices in both languages. As can be seen from the following, however, only English usage allows the employment of the unaccompanied indefinite article before a proper name.

2.3.1.1 Unaccompanied indefinite article before name. In English the proper noun may be preceded by the indefinite article with no other reinforcing element needed. In Hungarian, on the other hand, the use of the indefinite article is optional, but if present, it must be accompanied by an adjective preceding the name or nevű (or nevezetű) 'named,' after the noun:

a. 1. a Mr. Kis
   2. egy bizonyos Kis úr
   3. egy Kis nevű/nevezetű úr

2.3.1.2 Emphasis on indefiniteness of name. When a greater degree of indefiniteness is sought with regard to the name of the person being mentioned, both English and Hungarian have recourse to other indefinite determiners or adjectives for use before the name. The most common of these are one, a certain, and some ... or other in English, and bizonyos, valami or valamiféle in Hungarian:

a. 1. one Mr. Smith
   2. valami Smith úr

b. 1. a certain Mr. Smith
   2. bizonyos Smith nevű úr

c. 1. some Colonel Brown or other
   2. valamiféle Brown ezredes

The examples above are not meant to show a one-to-one correspondence between the English and Hungarian forms, but are meant to be illustrative. Furthermore, the English forms given above are used in fairly formal types of conversational style. In more informal styles constructions such as a person named ___, a man named - __, a boy named ___, etc., are commonly employed. The Hungarian equivalents follow much the same pattern type, although with different word order:

d. 1. a man named Smith
2. egy Smith nevű/nevezetű ember

e. 1. a boy named John
2. egy János nevű/nevezetű fiú

2.3.2 *Proper name meaning "having the qualities of X."* A proper name in either language may be converted to a common noun with the approximate meaning "a person (or place) having the pertinent qualities of the well-known individual (or place) who (which) originally bore the name." Thus we can have sentences of the type:

a. 1. *A* Shakespeare isn't born in every century.
2. *Egy* Shakespeare nem minden században születik.

As with other common nouns in Hungarian, this type of common-noun-from-proper-noun may also occur with Ø instead of the indefinite article *egy*, the English equivalent being best rendered by the indefinite article:

b. 1. Adyt látnak benne. (Tompa 1964:158)
2. They see an Ady in him.

In one instance the original English article is fused with the following determiner while the Hungarian equivalent retains the regular features of a qualified indefinite noun-phrase construction:

c. 1. another Byron
2. egy második/új Byron

2.3.3 *Optional use of article with modified proper noun.* In English one can find the indefinite article optionally used before a proper noun which is modified by a restrictive clause or other modifiers. The construction with the indefinite article may be labelled "marginal" or perhaps "formal," inasmuch as the less formal conversational styles usually employ the construction with zero. In Hungarian zero is the rule except in comparisons:

a. 1. (A) Paris without the Eiffel tower would seem incomplete.
   2. Párizs az Eiffel-torony nélkül befejezetlennek látszana.

but: b. 1. Egy Párizs nem hasonlítható X-városhoz.
   2. A Paris cannot be compared to X.

2.3.4 Summary of indefinite article usage with "proper nouns." In view of the discussion of the occurrence of the indefinite article with what seem to be proper nouns, it seems appropriate to enclose the term "proper noun" in quotation marks in the heading of this paragraph, for it is quite obvious that except for the "marginal" English example in 2.3.3, all of the other "proper nouns" treated here have gone over to the common noun category, both syntactically and semantically in both languages. Such a noun cooccurring with an indefinite article loses its status as a proper noun as such, since it is no longer the individual entity, but the characteristics of the entity which are brought to the fore in the discourse. Speaking in generative terms, we can say that it is the semantic features, rather than the referent underlying the lexical item carrying the semantic features, which are being referred to in the discourse. This differs substantially with the construction type mentioned in 1.5.2, in which the definite article appears before a proper noun. In the sentences below, for example, it can readily be seen that in a.1 a specific television personality is meant, while in a.2 any individual with the qualities of the famous personality is needed:

a. 1. Substituting for the vacationing Johnny Carson is ...
2. What this show needs is a Johnny Carson.

See Part II for further discussion on the definite-indefinite status of proper nouns.

CHAPTER III

THE ZERO ARTICLE

3.0 *Introduction*

Inasmuch as the zero article is not composed of any phonic substance or graphemic form, its existence is totally ignored in traditional grammars of either language under study here. However, postulating its existence for the purposes of linguistic analysis often produces a smoother description, providing that care is taken not to abuse its use. *Zero* must clearly be distinguished from *nothing*, that is, there must be sufficient structural or paradigmatic justification for positing a syntactic element with no positive phonic value. This justification, I believe, is to be found, for example, in a syntactic paradigm such as:

a table ...	egy asztal ... (or *∅* *asztal*)
the table ...	az asztal ...
∅ tables ...	∅ asztolok ...

It can be seen here that in English zero contrasts with *a* and *the* (and other determiners), while in Hungarian zero contrasts correspondingly with *egy* and *az* (and other determiners). On the other hand, *beautiful* and *szép* alternate with nothing, that is, with their absence--and not with zero--in such constructions as:

a beautiful table	egy szép asztal
a table	egy asztal

Nothing could occur between any two separable elements in a discourse while the presence of a postulated *zero* is strictly limited structurally.

In view of the foregoing brief introduction to the zero article, it becomes apparent that we have already had many encounters with it in this work, for in a full discussion of both the definite and indefinite articles in either language, it becomes necessary, for the sake of immediate completeness, to contrast their uses with their closest possible structural alternates. It remains for us here, accordingly, to recapitulate the statements already made in regard to the use of zero and to add other statements on usage not specifically treated above.

3.1 The zero article with common nouns

Both languages under study here employ the zero article before common nouns used in varying ways. Some of these types of usage have already been indicated in various paragraphs above and will be summarized here, with added detail where necessary.

3.1.1 Non-count nouns. As indicated above in paragraph 1.3.3, the zero article in English may occur before unmodified common nouns of the types that are traditionally called "mass nouns" and "abstract nouns." I feel that there is no real structural motivation for treating these two noun types separately in either English or Hungarian since in the given language they have the same syntactic characteristics. In this study the general terms non-count noun or uncountable will be employed as cover terms to include both mass nouns and abstract nouns.[1]

3.1.1.1 Generic non-count nouns. Unmodified non-count nouns used generically in English are generally preceded by the zero article. In Hungarian, on the other hand, all generics collocate with the definite article, even if they are unqualified:

a. 1. Poverty is no disgrace.
2. *A* szegénység nem szégyen.

b. 1. Steel is a very useful metal.
2. *Az* acél (egy) nagyon hasznos fém.

c. 1. I don't like coffee.
2. Nem szeretem *a* kávét.

With restrictive modifiers, of course, uncountables lose their generic value and appear with the definite article in English also:

d. 1. *The* poverty he experienced in his youth ...
2. *The* steel they ordered last week ...

3.1.1.2 *Non-count nouns as partitives.* When a non-count noun is used in a partitive (or unspecified) sense, the zero article prevails in Hungarian as well as in English, although *some* is a frequent alternate in the case of English partitives, and *egy kis*, and other determiners in the case of Hungarian:

a. 1. I'd like coffee.[2]
2. Kávét kérek.

b. 1. Is there sugar on the table?
2. Van cukor az asztalon?

3.1.2 *Count-nouns.* Count-nouns also behave differently with respect to the use of zero in the two languages being studied here. While English count-nouns as a rule must have a determiner other than zero--one notable exception being the noun *man* used generically--Hungarian may have count-nouns, with or without modifiers, with the zero article.

3.1.2.1 *"Classifying" nouns as predicates.* As indicated in 2.2.1 above, the "classifying" predicate nominative in Hungarian (as in most languages of Europe) is preceded by the zero article. By "classifying predicate nominative" is meant that noun which names the class to which the subject noun belongs. Some typical examples are:

a. 1. A fiam orvos.
   2. My son is *a* doctor.

b. 1. A barátom jó tanár.
   2. My friend is a good teacher.

c. 1. A barátaim tanárok.
   2. My friends are teachers.

An examination of the last three examples given above shows enough consistence in the use of the zero article in Hungarian that an analytic segmentation of structures as given above would have been unnecessary were it not for the fact that in English the article usage varies with the number of the predicate noun. Moreover, this use of the zero article with singular or plural, modified or unmodified predicate nouns in Hungarian is only one aspect of what we may now label *zero as the mark of unspecified noun* in Hungarian. The zero article, then, marks an unspecified noun in Hungarian, regardless of the number of syntactic position or function of the noun in the sentence. For example, a stressed unspecified noun with the zero article can appear in the singular and as the subject of the sentence:

d. 1. *Fiú* van a kertben.
   2. *A boy* is in the garden.

Countless other examples are to be found in which singular or plural stressed or unstressed nouns in object position occur with the zero article to indicate their unspecified nature:

e. 1. *Fiút* láttam a kertben.
   2. I saw *a boy* in the garden.

f. 1. *Újságot* olvasok.
   2. I'm reading *a newspaper*.

g. 1. *Újságokat* olvasok.
   2. I'm reading *newspapers*.

3.1.3 Unspecified possessive. Also included in the unspecified category of common nouns with the zero article in Hungarian is what I would call the "introductory possessive construction." We have seen in 1.4.3 above that the definite article usually occurs with a possessed noun in Hungarian when the possessor noun is deleted. This is true, however, only when the possession has been previously mentioned or is situationally understood. Therefore, if the fact of possession is just being established in the discourse, then the zero article is used, not the definite. This is, of course, parallel to the change from the (introductory) definite article to the definite article with common nouns in non-possessive constructions in both English and Hungarian. In the case of "introductory" vs. "definite" possessive constructions in English, the article usage changes from the indefinite to the genitive article, as can be seen in the following examples:

a. 1. Kalapom van.
   2. I have a hat.

which in subsequent discourse may become, for example,

b. 1. A kalapom az asztalon van.
   2. My hat is on the table.

This, of course, is a matter which will receive further treatment in the subsequent discussion on definiteness.

3.2 The zero article with proper nouns

As an introduction to our discussion on the use of the zero article with proper nouns, it seems appropriate to restate and to emphasize what had been briefly mentioned in 1.2 above, namely, that there often is no clear-cut boundary between the categories "common" and "proper" when referring to, for example, situationally identified nouns in one given language, and that, furthermore, the equivalent of what may be treated as a "clear-cut" proper noun in one language may not be so treated in another language. Moreover, as shown in 2.3, a noun treated as "proper" in one context may be converted to a "common noun" in another syntactic environment, depending on the definitional criteria one uses. With these admonitions in mind, and using the standard dictionary definition of *proper noun*[3] as a working hypothesis, we may now venture to proceed with our contrastive analysis.

3.2.1 *Zero with an unqualified proper noun.* The dictionary definition of proper noun quoted in footnote 3 notwithstanding, the lack of a "limiting modifier" can hardly be considered a necessary criterion for classifying lexical items as "proper nouns" in English. We have already seen that the definite article must be considered to be part of the name--of the "proper noun"--in such unqualified items as: *the Hague*, *the Mississippi* (*River*), *the Azores*, and countless others, not to mention such names as *the United States*, *the Milky Way*, *the Northstar*, etc., which also have a "qualifier" as an integral part of the name. The emphatic modal *must* was used in the preceding sentence for we clearly have:

a. 1. Have you ever seen the/The Hague?
and 2. Have you ever seen Paris?
but not 3. *Have you ever seen Hague?

also b. 1. Can you see the Northstar tonight?
and 2. Can you see Venus tonight?
but not 3. *Can you see Northstar tonight?

However, the occurrence of the definite article as a part of a name is not the statistical rule in either language being discussed here. This statement applies primarily to personal names where zero is the rule, although we have already mentioned the fact that personal names in Hungarian often occur with the definite article, as do some nicknames in English: a János 'John,' a Kovács Pista, etc. 'Steve Smith,' etc.; the Toe, the Body, and the like.

3.2.1.1 Family name as collective. Zero also occurs in Hungarian constructions in which a family name is used in reference not to a single individual but to the whole identified family bearing the name, although here, too, one may find instances of the definite article as an optional element in the construction:

a. 1. Találkoztam (a) Kovácsékkal tegnap.
   2. I met the Smiths last night.

In historical contexts the article is required in Hungarian also: the Habsburgs, a Habburgok, paralleling the usage required before the names of nationality groups used as collectives: the Romans, a rómaiak; the Hungarians, a magyarok, etc.

3.2.2 Post-posed qualifiers in English personal names. There is, however, a series of personal names in which both the definite article and the qualifier of permanent characteristics are present--in post-posed position--in English, while the Hungarian equivalent has the zero article with the pre-posed modifier. Regardless of how one wants to interpret the English construction synchronically, whether as a reduced appositive or simply as a calque patterned after the French, the Hungarian equivalent displays the regular pattern of zero article plus qualifier plus noun that we have seen used with common nouns:

Charles the Bold	Merész Károly
Charles the Fair	Szép Károly

Frederick *the* Great	Nagy Frigyes
Richard *the* Second	Második Richárd
Henry *the* First	Első Henrik

As a curiosity may be mentioned the fact that with at least one name of a royal ruler the French form has been preferred over the two other competing constructions:

	Charlemagne	Nagy Károly
also	Charles *the* Great	
and	Charles *the* First	

In this particular instance the English name also contains zero in the first variant and is subject to modification as are other names with zero, e.g., *the great Charlemagne*. This is, of course, the same pattern as in, for example, *the great Napoleon*, where the qualification may even be considered to be a regular part of the name, depending on how strongly one is historically oriented.

3.2.3 *Place names with various qualifiers*. When place names have post-posed restrictive modifiers of various kinds, both English and Hungarian article usage alternates between zero and the definite article. With the zero article we could have:

a. 1. Paris in the 18th century ...
   2. Párizs a 18. században ...

With optional variation in English:

b. 1. (the) Paris of the 18th century ...
   2. a 18. századi Párizs

and normally with zero in English; the definite article in Hungarian:

c. 1. 18th century Paris ...
   2. a 18. századi Párizs ...

A post-posed restrictive-clause modifier with a place name has the same effect as with a personal name, as can be seen in the following:

d. 1. The Paris that we love. (Book by Maurois, Cousteau, *et al.*)
2. A Párizs, amelyet szeretünk. or
3. A mi szeretett Párizsunk.

It may be incidentally remarked here that a place name which already has an article as a constituent appears with only one article in English:[4]

e. 1. The Hague that I love ...
and not 2. *The the Hague that I love ...
3. A Hága, amelyet szeretek
or: 4. Az én szeretett Hágám.

Under conditions of emphasis, however, English may substitute the stressed allomorph of *the* /ði:/, while the Hungarian equivalent under the same conditions displays a replacement of the definite article by the demonstrative, which on the surface seems to be composed of two juxtaposed definite articles, but which must be interpreted differently because of stress placement:

f. 1. This isn't the United States (that) I used to know.
2. Ez nem az az Egyesült Államok, amelyet én (valaha) ismertem.

As these types of constructions will be discussed further in subsequent chapters, we shall accordingly end this section of our analysis with the foregoing brief remark.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. It goes without saying that nouns which are otherwise "semantic equivalents" in English and Hungarian do not necessarily agree in membership in the categories of "countable" and "uncountable" nouns. In this section only those "equivalents" which agree in the latter respect also will be discussed here. See Chapter XVI for a fuller analysis of number as it applies to the grammars of English and Hungarian.

2. Of course, like other non-count nouns, *coffee* and its Hungarian counterpart *kávé* may be converted to count-nouns with the meaning "serving or portion of coffee," as in the informal request "Two coffees, please." Hungarian has "Két kávét kérek" as an equivalent, and may go even further in reduction with "Két feketét, (kérek)," "Two blacks (please)."

3. For example, the definition found in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, page 1818a: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing, does not take a limiting modifier, and is usu. capitalized in English." The second part of this definition, strictly speaking, would eliminate such proper names as *the Hague*, *the Atlantic (Ocean)*, *the United States*, etc., from the category "proper noun"--not to mention all others used in varying ways discussed in this work--inasmuch as the definition of "limiting" given elsewhere in the same dictionary (page 1313a) must include the definite article: "of a modifying word: serving to limit the application of the modified noun without reference to quality, kind, or condition (as *this* in *this book*, *which* in *which book*) or to express the absence of limitation (as *any* in *any book*)--distinguished from *descriptive*." As the term "proper name" is a widespread equivalent of "proper noun," it will also be used in this work as a full synonym of the latter.

4. The decision as to which article is deleted from the underlying structure here seems to be completely arbitrary.

PART TWO

THE CATEGORY OF DEFINITENESS

INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO

With the completion of the above survey of article usage in English and Hungarian, we may now turn our attention to another important aspect of grammatical structure, namely the category of definiteness in English and Hungarian. This grammatical and syntactic category not only has close structural connections with article selection in the two languages being contrasted here, but with other types of syntactic relationships as well. Unfortunately, spacial limitations will prevent us from examining all linguistically important aspects of this problem.[1] Because of the wide range of categories to be covered in this contrastive work, we can give only the most salient contrastive features of this particular category at this time. A conscious knowledge of these salient features, however, is absolutely essential for a proper command of both the articles and the conjugational system of Hungarian. Consequently, at least the following minimal information relating to definiteness should be noted by the speaker of English attempting to acquire a workable command of Hungarian.

The all-pervading nature of the grammatical category of definiteness in English has been recognized in linguistic literature for quite some time, but attempts to define it formally have not met with great success. For Bloomfield (1933:204), for example, this category remained a hazy notion, and he was forced to rely heavily on semantic criteria--which he otherwise eschewed--rather than structural criteria for his incipient formulation.

> The definite and indefinite categories may be said, in fact, to embrace the entire class of English noun expressions, because even those types of noun expressions which do not always take a determiner, can be classed as definite or indefinite: John, for instance, as definite, kindness as indefinite.

Why John is more "definite" than kindness is not further explained, not even on semantic grounds, by Bloomfield. One can certainly find no structural basis for considering either noun in isolation as definite, for both collocate with the same determiner, zero. When either is modified, the same determiner is used in the ensuing structures. It is only in a discourse context that we can speak of any noun phrase as being "definite," and it is only then that the nature of the noun phrase determines which particular determiner will be manifested in the given syntactic structure. The "nature" of the noun phrase, then, clearly includes both semantic and syntactic criteria, for restrictions placed on the occurrence of any noun in a given environment depend, first of all, on the semantic properties of the noun, then on its syntactic properties. These semantic and syntactic features are difficult to separate, inasmuch as the "total meaning" of any lexical item includes the whole range of environments in which the item can occur. A purely structural definition of the grammatical category of definiteness is, consequently, doomed to failure. Hence, we can understand Bloomfield's hesitancy, as a structural linguist, to launch into a fuller analysis of the phenomenon.

More recently, Carlotta Smith (1964:37), working within the framework of transformational-generative grammar, has attempted to give a structural definition of the category of definiteness, although, like Bloomfield, she begins her inquiry within a semantic-notional framework:

> Speakers make distinctions of definiteness and indefiniteness for all noun phrases, not just those with the determiners *the* or *a*. For instance, *John* is said by many speakers to be more definite than *the man*, which is in turn more definite than *any man*; *my book* is more definite than *the book*.

Smith (1964:38) then attempts to give a structural formulation to these intuitive statements, and, on the basis of ability to "accept" restrictive or non-restrictive clauses, goes on to postulate the existence not of a dichotomy of "definite" and "indefinite determiners," but rather a scale of definiteness as it relates to determiners. The highest degree of definiteness, which Smith labels "unique," is characteristic of Ø with a proper noun, which accepts appositive (non-restrictive) relatives only. On the other extreme of the scale is the "unspecified" degree, which is characteristic of such determiners as *any* or *all*, which accept restrictive clauses only. In the middle is the "specified" degree, characteristic of *a*, *the*, or Ø, which accept either restrictive or non-restrictive clauses.

In this study I will attempt to show that such a tripartite division of definiteness is indeed necessary, but that Smith's formulation is deficient on several grounds. It is readily apparent, for example, that Ø appears in two categories, unique and specified, and that its presence in the unique class is bound up with its co-occurrence with a proper noun. Several questions immediately arise: 1) If the definiteness of Ø is dependent on patterning with different noun phrase types, how is Ø any "more definite" than *the*, which, among other things, can also precede a proper noun? and 2) Under what conditions do proper nouns occur with determiners other than Ø, and what is the status of definiteness of such proper nouns? These and similar questions may well be asked here because in her formulation Smith proceeds from type of determiner, "developed by expansion rules at the phrase structure level of the grammar," (1964:38) to co-occurrence restrictions: "The determiner of the noun phrase is the decisive element in the acceptance of relative clauses." (p.37) What will be attempted in this part of this study is an analysis of the conditions which determine the selection of a particular determiner in the first place.

While there are to my knowledge no full-length descriptive analyses dealing primarily with the category of definiteness in Hungarian, there are many shorter statements dealing with it to be found in traditional and structural grammars of Hungarian. Since it has an immediate effect on the selection of verb conjugation, definiteness is nearly always mentioned secondarily in connection with verb forms, not as a grammatical category in itself (e.g., Tompa 1962:158-60). As is well known, Hungarian has two contrasting sets of verbal personal suffixes used on transitive verbs, depending on the nature of the direct object noun phrase. If the object noun phrase is considered to be "definite," then the personal endings of the "definite conjugation" are employed; if, on the other hand, the object noun phrase is not considered to be "definite" (or if the given verb is intransitive as such or is used without an object), then the endings of the "indefinite conjugation" are called for.[2]

The criteria for determining when a given noun phrase is to be considered "definite" in Hungarian are partly structional and partly notional, as in English, and in part so closely resemble the traditional criteria given for the parallel category in English that they seem to be paraphrases of them. A typical series of statements of this sort is given by Bánhidi, Jókay, and Szabó (1965:112-13):

> The object is considered definite:--
>
> (a) if the object is preceded by the definite article *a*, *az* ...
> (b) if the object is a proper noun ...
> (c) if the object is the 3rd person pronoun: *őt*, *őket*, or a demonstrative pronoun ...
> (d) if the object is expressed by an object clause ...
> (e) if the object is a noun to which a possessive suffix has been added ...

Criteria (b), (c), and (e) above are remarkably similar to those indicated, for example, in the following quotation from an article written by a transformationist (Fillmore 1964:967): "... restrictive relative clauses are not attached to definite nouns like MY WIFE, definite pronouns, and proper names." Furthermore, criterion (d), object classes, is the main topic of discussion of the article by Fillmore from which the above quotation was taken.

Now in regard to the list of criteria for determining definiteness of noun phrases in Hungarian, one can immediately think of a considerable number of obvious questions which must be answered if one is to arrive at an adequate statement as to when a given noun phrase is actually definite. In giving answers to these questions on noun phrases in Hungarian, one simultaneously gives answers to similar questions relating to noun phrases in English as well, for, as we shall soon see, we are dealing with phenomena which are at least bilingually "universal." The following may be included in questions of this type:

(a) 1. Just when is the definite article used in Hungarian and English ?
    2. Does a noun phrase with the definite article always behave the same way structurally with regard to the category of definiteness ?

(b) 1. What is a proper noun anyway ?
    2. Are "proper nouns" always "proper nouns"?

(c) 1. Are all 3rd person pronouns definite?
    2. Are any pronouns of the other persons definite ?

(d) 1. Are all object clauses definite?
    2. What verbs govern object clauses of other types?

(e) 1. Are all possessive forms definite?
    2. How are possessives otherwise marked for definiteness?

Our aim in Part II of this study, then, is to investigate such questions relating to the category of definiteness in both English and Hungarian, and, for the purposes of easier explication, we shall divide our discussion into chapters according to the five main criteria given above, with the exception that definite and indefinite pronouns are afforded separate chapters because of their great number and complexity.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION TO PART II

1. For more detail regarding definiteness and indefiniteness in English and Hungarian, see Orosz 1969, which is an expanded version of Part II.

2. The indefinite and definite conjugations are also called "subjective" and "objective" (Hungarian *alanyi* and *tárgyas*) respectively. However, I agree with John Lotz (1962:320), who calls this terminology "misleading." In sentences as, for example, "János újságot olvas," 'John is reading a newspaper,' and "János az újságot olvassa," 'John is reading the newspaper,' the traditional terms and their Hungarian counterparts do absolutely nothing to specify under what conditions the indefinite conjugation is employed, as in the first example, nor why the definite is employed in a sentence as the second. In the same article cited above Lotz introduces the terms "non-determinate" and "determinate" for indefinite and definite respectively. I am retaining the latter set of terms here, however, as they have slightly more mnemonic value.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEFINITE ARTICLE AS A MARKER OF DEFINITENESS

4.0 Introduction

For the purpose of initiating our discussion of definiteness we may repeat a statement made earlier: "The principal use of the definite article in both languages is to mark a nominal as having been previously identified. This identification may stem from previous mention in the discourse or from the situation in which the discourse is taking place." This statement is obviously an oversimplification, and what is needed now is a discussion of: a) what actually constitutes "previous mention" which is adequate for making a noun (phrase) definite, and b) to what extent does the discourse "situation" provide sufficient mutual knowledge for given entities to be considered "definite" without having been overtly mentioned in the prior discourse. The following discussion of these and related issues will be conducted primarily from the point of view of the English language, but will be applicable--unless otherwise stated--to the corresponding situations in Hungarian as well, as the translations of the English sample sentences will testify.

4.1 Previous mention in discourse

While it is generally well known that the use of the definite article is sometimes obligatory with a noun phrase that has been previously introduced into a discourse, the total picture of this aspect of article usage is by no means clear as yet. The reason for the lingering uncertainty in this area of linguistic analysis perhaps lies in the fact that the area includes both aspects of "meaning," which has been shunned for so long by structuralists, and also "extra-linguistic" factors, which is a catch-all phrase often used by transformationalists as a substitute for "extrasentential," their formal analysis not extending beyond the (single) sentence. Definiteness must be viewed in light of the whole discourse,[1] and upon closer inspection of such discourse situations, it becomes quite apparent that "previous mention" of a noun may be so varied that subsequent use of the definite article with the previously mentioned noun may be either *obligatory*, *optional*, or totally *excluded*.

4.1.1 *Obligatory use of the definite article after previous mention*. The obligatory use of the definite article with nouns that (or the referents of which) have been previously mentioned in the discourse may be illustrated in the following sample sentences:

a. 1. I saw a pretty woman with a small girl yesterday. *The* woman said ...
2. Láttam tegnap egy csinos nőt egy kis lánnyal együtt. *A* nő azt mondta ...

Here, and in similar discourse situations, two factors are operating simultaneously to call for the obligatory use of the definite article in the second sentence of each pair: 1) The introduction of *a woman* in the first sentence, which as declarative and non-negative, is sufficient for definitization, while 2) the fact that there are two female referents in the introductory sentence militates against the use of the ("definite") personal pronoun *she*, which would otherwise be preferred in ordinary conversational situations. The equivalent situation in Hungarian is similar except that the gender distinction of the 3rd person personal pronoun is lacking. The use of the article together with the noun in Hungarian is likewise mandatory, however, since there are two 3rd person referents present in the first sentence, precluding the unambiguous use of the singular 3rd person personal pronoun *ő* (or zero) before the verb. After the introductory sentence, such as in a.1, the use of *a woman* (Hungarian *egy nő*) in referring to the same woman further in the discourse could be considered *ungrammatical*; the use of *she* (Hungarian *ő* or zero) would be considered *ambiguous*, and would require further identification. Hence the use of the term "obligatory" in this section. The use of the definite article to mark the noun as having been previously mentioned is obligatory, then, for normal, effective communication in both languages being analyzed here.

4.1.2 *Optional use of the definite article after previous mention*. We have just alluded above to an obvious situation in which the use of the definite article could be considered optional in either language. Whenever a discourse phase begins with a sentence which has but one new referent introduced into the discourse, the subsequent occurrences of the previously-mentioned noun with the definite article may be replaced by a personal pronoun (by definition, in the third person) in English, and by a third-person personal pronoun or zero in Hungarian. This is perhaps the most common process of definitization in the spoken standards, although the use of the subsequent noun phrase with the definite article can hardly be labelled "ungrammatical." Everyday discourse situations are replete with examples of this type of "definite" pronoun usage. We shall, however, give but one sample sentence here for the sake of brevity:

a. 1. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. The woman said ...
or 2. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. She said ...

b. 1. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. A nő azt mondta ...
or 2. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Ő azt mondta ...
or 3. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Azt mondta ...

It can also be seen from the second sentence in b.3 that, because of the verbal suffixes being unambiguously marked for person and number, Hungarian has an additional optional replacement possibility for the previously-mentioned noun phrase, namely zero. This replacement is "optional," of course, only to the extent that the unambiguous, unemphatic discourse situation allows the process to take place. Ambiguous contexts, emphasis, or contrast would naturally block its occurrence. The whole phenomenon of the replacement of the definite article + noun phrase is complex enough to warrant further discussion, as is the whole process of pronominalization in general; consequently we must defer further analysis of it until the following chapter.

4.1.3 *Excluded use of the definite article after "previous mention."* No discussion of the use of the definite article to mark a previously-mentioned noun would be complete without a statement of recognition of the fact that "previous mention" actually does not always establish a discourse referent capable of allowing an acceptable definitization of the noun phrase to take place in subsequent discourse.[2] For example, although *a car* is "mentioned" in the first clause of the sentence in a.1 below, it would be at least semantically anomalous to continue with *the car* in the second clause, since the actual existence of the car has just been denied. There is no actual discourse referent present:

a. 1. *I don't have a car, but the car is black.
   2. *Nincs-kocsim, de a kocsi fekete.

Here again, a fuller discussion of these matters would lead us too far into the field of philosophy; consequently, we shall allow these brief observations to stand as they are at this point.

4.1.4 Synonyms in previous mention. Another aspect of definitization through previous mention is likewise difficult to characterize analytically, but is nonetheless quite frequent at all levels of usage and warrants mention at this point in our study. This phenomenon is the use of different morphological forms to refer to the same entity in different parts of the discourse, a topic which has received considerable attention in recent linguistic literature, particularly literature dealing with the development of the theory of transformational-generative grammar.[3] These alternate forms of the noun phrase may range from recognized (or approximate synonyms of the previously-mentioned noun) to mere subjective characterization of the referent in question ("pronominal epithets"). Thus in the following sentences we can have definite noun phrases following previously-mentioned ones even though the subsequently occurring noun phrases have nothing in common morphologically with the latter:

a. 1. I met a wise man yesterday, and the sage told me many interesting things.
   2. I came across a street urchin yesterday and caught the little tyke trying to pick my pocket.
   3. I met a fast-talking salesman yesterday, and the robber tried to sell me a radio at double the regular price.

This is perhaps a form of "situational identification," for although the definite nouns in the second parts of the above sentences have not been mentioned, strictly speaking, in the preceding part of the sentence, the native hearer knows that the two noun phrases in each sentence refer to the same individual in each case. The mere juxtaposition of the two noun phrases in each sentence is sufficient for this mutual understanding. To what extent such (obviously optional) switching takes place at various levels of usage is more a stylistic, rather than a linguistic matter, but it must be recognized that it is by no means a rare phenomenon in either language. Possible Hungarian equivalents of the above sentences are the following:

b. 1. Egy okos embert ismertem meg tegnap, és a bölcs(elő) sok érdekes dolgot mondott nekem.
   2. Egy utcagyerek került az utamba tegnap, és rajtakaptam a kis komiszt, amint ki akart zsebelni.
   3. Egy fontoskodó ügynökkel talélkoztam tegnap, és a csirkefogó egy rádiót akart nekem eladni dupla áron.

4.1.5 **Definite noun phrases as part of previously-mentioned noun.** Another subtype of definitization through previous mention which more or less merges with situational identification occurs with the employment of a definite noun phrase which represents only [illegible] of the previously mentioned (collective) noun, or which names the individual members of which the group is composed or which are naturally or culturally associated with the entity in question. There may or may not be any overt morphemic connection between the two given noun phrases, but inasmuch as the speaker assumes his hearer possesses the body of knowledge necessary to make the proper connection between the two nouns without further elaboration, the second noun phrase may be an unqualified definite noun phrase in the same manner as an "identical" noun can, or any of the "synonyms" mentioned in the previous paragraph. Several examples of this type of definitization are as follows:

a. 1. I saw a parade yesterday.
   2. The marchers all wore old-fashioned costumes.

b. 1. There was a big traffic jam downtown yesterday.
   2. The cars were jammed bumper-to-bumper for ten blocks.

c. 1. I observed a very interesting class yesterday.
   2. The students were very intelligent.

When the relationship between the two given noun phrases is not that of a part to the whole but rather one of conventional association, then distinction between the two types of definitization being discussed here is indeed hazy, as in: "A firetruck ... The firemen ..."[4]

4.2 Situational identification of noun phrases

Besides being previously mentioned, another way in which a given noun phrase may be considered eligible for collocation with the definite article is through what I have broadly labelled "situational identification." This term is simply a catch-all expression to indicate merely that, in a particular discourse situation, both speaker and hearer are presumed to know what the referent of a given noun phrase is without its having been mentioned in prior discourse. The term situation is to be taken in its broadest sense here--from one's immediate environment to the whole of the knowable universe. This proposition may be resting on shaky philosophical grounds, but it is, I believe, a simple and practical analytical solution to an involved problem which otherwise requires extensive explication. In paragraph 1.2 above we gave examples of typical situationally-identified noun phrases in English and Hungarian. These examples should suffice to illustrate the principle involved here, although their number could have easily been extended into the thousands.

4.3 Structural correlates of definitization as marked by definite article

To turn the notion of definiteness into a grammatical category one needs, of course, to find structural relationships between the definitized noun phrase in question and other elements in the discourse. This is, naturally, a relatively simple matter when it comes to article usage. We have seen that the use of the definite article may be even required before a noun phrase which has been definitized by previous mention in the discourse, and, in addition to this, that the definite article may be used before other nouns, the referents of which, in the given discourse situations, are mutually known (or can be pointed to) and therefore may be considered definite without having been mentioned in prior discourse. Now what remains here for us is to determine what other structural significance may be attached to the fact that a given noun--in either language--is considered to be definite. In addition to the obvious patterning with the definite article the following structural relationships may be considered as being necessary correlates to the definitization of noun phrases. We shall start first with the pertinent structural pattern of English.

4.3.1 Occurrence with non-restrictive clauses. The unqualified statement has often been made in recent linguistic literature that restrictive relative clauses are not attached to definite nouns (e.g., Fillmore 1964:96). An obvious corollary to this statement would be the supposition that definite noun phrases collocate only with non-restrictive clauses. Both of these assertions are false, as can be readily determined from an examination of the syntactic behavior of definitized noun phrases with the as their determiner. We have already indicated in the Introduction to Part II that, as Carlotta Smith (1964:38) pointed out, if patterning with relative clauses is to be taken as the chief criterion for determining definiteness, then there seems to be justification for postulating not two, but three degrees of definiteness. This seems reasonable inasmuch as a noun phrase with the may pattern with either type of relative clause, depending on other factors in the discourse, while the remaining noun types tend to pattern either with restrictive clauses solely, or only with non-restrictive ones. Accordingly, it does seem to be true at first glance that the man, for example, can be followed only by non-restrictive clauses, unless the clause which follows is a repetition (or paraphrase) of the prior mention itself which formed the basis of the definitization process in the first place:[5]

a. 1. I met an interesting man yesterday.
   2. *The man who was very intelligent told me many interesting things.
   3. The man (whom) I met (yesterday) was very intelligent.

Now except for such a repetitive clause as in a.3, it is indeed quite difficult to construct a restrictive clause that would readily be acceptable with a definitized (and singular) noun phrase such as the man. However, when one considers plural noun phrases, then the feature of "totality" vs. "partiality" must be taken into consideration. This we shall do in the following paragraph. However, for the moment it seems necessary that we view the obverse of the coin in regard to the co-occurrence of noun phrases with restrictive clauses. As indicated above, a *definite* noun phrase, such as *the man* in a.2, cannot be modified by a non-restrictive relative clause if the noun phrase refers to *all* of the previously-mentioned referent(s), which, indeed, singular noun phrases do. When it comes to *indefinite* noun phrases, on the other hand, we can show that these can be followed by restrictive clauses only, and not by non-restrictive ones. The following examples illustrate this feature of indefinite noun phrases:

b. 1. Yesterday I met a man who is very interesting.
   2. *Yesterday I met a man, who is very interesting.[6]
   3. We are looking for a speaker who is interesting.
   4. *We are looking for a speaker, who is interesting.

and also: c. 1. Any book which is about sex is interesting.
   2. *Any book, which is about sex, is interesting.

In summary, then, we may state that some definite noun phrases (i.e., those with the syntactic feature of *totality*) can collocate only with non-restrictive relative clauses (appostive clauses), other definites (i.e., those with the feature of partiality) pattern with restrictive clauses, while indefinite noun phrases can pattern with restrictive relative clauses only.

4.3.2 *Partiality indicated by a non-restrictive clause.*

When a definite noun phrase is in the plural, there can be a contrast in relative clause type (with a corresponding contrast in meaning) following the noun, which is not possible with singular definite noun phrases. The following sentences were given previously to illustrate this:

a. 1. I met a group of (or *some*, etc.) men yesterday.
   2. The men, who were intelligent, were very interesting.
   3. The men who were intelligent were very interesting.

Sentence b.2 has the obvious meaning that all of the men were both intelligent and interesting; b.3, on the other hand, implies that only some of the men were intelligent and that only these were interesting. Consequently, while there can be no doubt that the men in b.2 and b.3 are noun phrases made definite through previous mention in b.1, it is primarily the presence or absence of the additional syntactic feature of totality which determines the type of relative clause admissible after the given noun phrase. (In generative terms, there is a difference in deep structures.) Now it must be recognized that totality is a feature of the discourse in the same way that definiteness is, for totality is considered in relation to the (plural or collective) noun phrase previously mentioned in the discourse. Therefore, the men in b.2 represent all of the men previously mentioned in b.1, while in b.3, the men represent a totality only in relation to those meeting the requirements of intelligence, and not in relation to the previously-mentioned persons as a whole group.

4.4 Structural correlates of definiteness in Hungarian

We have already shown in the first chapter that the use of the definite article in Hungarian parallels the use of the definite article in English in many instances. Both processes of definitization which were discussed mainly in regard to the noun phrase in English, i.e., previous mention and situational identification, apply to Hungarian noun phrases as well, as we have seen from the examples in sections 4.1 and 4.2. In addition to this, rules governing the replacement of definite noun phrases preceded by the definite article, or rules applying restrictions

74

on the employment of definite noun phrases are also much the same in the two languages being analyzed here. It remains for us now 1) to test whether co-occurrence restrictions apply to definite noun phrases and relative clauses in Hungarian also, and 2) to determine what other structural manifestations are inherent in the category of definiteness in Hungarian.

4.4.1 Co-occurrence of definite noun phrases with relative clauses. In paragraph 4.3.2 we have tried to indicate that it is the presence or absence of the syntactic feature of totality which is the crucial factor in determining whether a non-restrictive or restrictive clause is to follow a definite noun phrase in English.[7] From the Hungarian equivalents for the English examples from this same paragraph which we now give below, it can be seen that, while the same semantic distinctions regarding totality and partiality can be and are made in the definitization process in both languages, the structural patterns employed to signal these distinctions do vary from one language to the next. Compare the English sentences discussed above with their equivalents:

a. 1. I met a group of men yesterday.
   2. The men, who were intelligent, were very interesting.
   3. The men who were intelligent were very interesting.

b. 1. Egy csoport férfit ismertem meg tegnap.
   2. A férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.
   3. Azok a férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.

Since there is apparently no regular phonemic (nor, as we can see, graphemic) distinction between a restrictive and a non-restrictive relative clause in such instances in Hungarian, the distinction here between total and partial subsequent reference must be made elsewhere in the sentence. Thus, while English singles out part of the group of men mentioned in a.1 by adding an indispensable qualification to the subsequently definite noun in a.3, Hungarian achieves the same type of focus by the additional employment of the stressed demonstrative pronoun (b.3), inasmuch as the definite article alone cannot bear full stress here. The combination of demonstrative plus definite article corresponds to the demonstrative adjective *this/that*, *these/those* in English, but because of morphological considerations to be discussed further below, it should be analyzed, nonetheless, as being composed of two separate elements.

4.4.1.1 *Different clause types as marked by pronouns in Hungarian.* Although in the examples given immediately above, only plural relative pronouns could be used to refer to the plural subjects, there are instances where a contrast of totality vs. partiality may be achieved by the use of a singular vs. a plural relative pronoun. This seems to be limited to instances where the antecedent of the pronoun in question is semantically plural but grammatically singular. (See Chapter XIX for further illustrations of this.) The English glosses show that the object in a.1 is only a part of the whole, while in b.1 it is the totality of poems mentioned:

a. 1. Három Petőfi verset olvastam, *ami* érdekes volt.
   2. I read three Petofi poems *which* were interesting.

b. 1. Három Petőfi verset olvastam, *amik* érdekes voltak.
   2. I read three Petofi poems, *all of which* were interesting.

This pattern, however, seems to be quite restricted, and not at all as consistent as the one illustrated previously.

4.4.2 Definite conjugation with definite noun phrase objects. Perhaps the most widely discussed aspect of the category of definiteness in Hungarian is the fact that there are two contrasting sets of personal transitive-verb endings, the selection of which depends on the degree of definiteness of the direct object of the verb in question. These conjugation types have varying names, but, as indicated above, the pedagogically useful designations definite conjugation and indefinite conjugation will be used in this work. Many pedagogical grammars of Hungarian state simply that the definite conjugation is employed when the direct object, if any, is considered "definite;" otherwise the endings of the indefinite conjugation are used. The first "criterion" of definiteness which is usually given, then, is the presence of the definite article before the object noun. This practice was followed in the list of criteria given in the Introduction to Part II of this study. This structural relationship, definite conjugation with definite noun object marked by the definite article, seems to hold true in all cases, for in the data used in this study there are no instances of the definite conjugation not being used when the direct object is a definitized noun phrase with az. At the same time, many, if not all, of the remaining criteria usually given for definiteness are either subject to qualification of some sort, or are structurally dependent on the unmistakable definiteness of noun phrases which are preceded by az.

4.4.3 Contrasts in verb endings with definite and indefinite noun objects. We have shown above that, while the same type of definitization process takes place in both languages under study here, the surface manifestations of the definite article before situationally identified nouns of various types do not always coincide. Consequently, conjugation selection may look erratic from the English point of view simply because English article usage is often "erratic," that is to say, has exceptions within even one noun type. We have shown, for example, that in Hungarian the use of the definite article with nouns used generically--here re-interpreted as "situationally identified"--is consistent while the English varies. Conjugation type usage in Hungarian, accordingly, will vary with the generic or non-generic employment of the noun, i.e., with the presence or absence of the definite article, while the English forms give no hint of variation in article (or, of course, verb) usage. The following examples of this phenomenon are given:[8]

a. 1. I like coffee. (generic)
   2. Szeretem a kávét.

b. 1. I'd like coffee. (non-generic)
   2. Kávét szeretnék.

c. 1. I don't like cats. (generic)
   2. Nem szeretem a macskákat.

It goes without saying that it is not only generic constructions which conceal their (situationally identified) definite features by the lack of the definite article in English. Singular count-nouns in English may be qualified in such a manner that the definite article is not manifested, while the Hungarian equivalent retains the expected definite article, and, as a consequence, employs the definite conjugation if such a noun is the direct object of the verb. Typical examples of this type of definite construction in English are those which have a "genitive construction" in place of the definite article, which may or may not have a possessive construction in the Hungarian equivalent, as illustrated in the following example:

d. 1. I'm reading today's newspaper.[9]
   2. Olvasom a mai újságot.

This definite usage is in contrast with the non-specified use of the noun, requiring the use of an indefinite determiner in the singular in English, but with optional zero--and the indefinite conjugation--with both singular or plural count-nouns so employed in Hungarian:

e. 1. I'm reading a newspaper.
   2. Ujságot olvasok.

f. 1. I'm reading (some) old newspapers.
   2. Régi újságokat olvasok.

4.4.4 *The effect of word order on the use of the definite conjugation in Hungarian.* While it is certainly true that a single definite noun phrase used as a direct object in Hungarian entails the use of the definite conjugation, it is not necessarily true that this same definite noun phrase object would govern the use of the definite conjugation if there is also an indefinite noun phrase present as an object of the same verb in the same clause.[10] Here it is a matter of the placement of emphasis through word order, for if the definite noun phrase occurs directly before the verb, in the position of maximum emphasis, or immediately after the verb and before the indefinite object, then the definite conjugation is used. Otherwise the indefinite noun phrase is in an emphatic position and consequently blocks the use of the definite conjugation. The following examples will illustrate this:

a. 1. A tanár látja a fiút és egy lányt.
   2. A tanár egy lányt és a fiut látja.
   3. A tanár a fiút látja és egy lányt.
   4. The teacher sees the boy and a girl.

b. 1. A tanár lát egy lányt és a fiút.
2. A tanár a fiút és egy lányt lát.
3. A tanár egy lányt lát és a fiút.[11]
4. The teacher sees a girl and the boy.

In sentence a.1, the definite noun phrase a fiút is in the "normal" (i.e., non-emphatic) object position after the verb and governs the definite conjugation because of proximity. In a.2 and a.3, on the other hand, the definite noun phrase is in the emphatic position immediately preceding the verb, which, as a consequence, must have the ending of the definite conjugation regardless of where the indefinite noun phrase is located in the sentence. These sentences may be contrasted to those in b., where the indefinite noun phrase object now intrudes between the verb and the definite noun phrase and in this way prevents the employment of the definite conjugation. Occurrence in the position of emphasis immediately before the verb not only governs the use of the conjugation types in Hungarian, but has a great deal of other syntactic significance as well, as will be shown in Part III.

4.5 Summary of structural correlates of definitization

In this chapter, after having established that only previous mention and situational identification make a noun phrase definite in either English or Hungarian, we have shown that, in addition to the ability to pattern with the definite article, there are other structural manifestations in both languages relating to the definitization of a noun phrase. In English, first of all, we have seen that a definite noun phrase can be followed by a non-restrictive relative clause (when the additional feature of totality--in relation to the previously-mentioned referent--is present in the definite noun phrase). Otherwise a restrictive clause is possible after the noun phrase. In Hungarian, on the other hand, while there seems to be no regular phonemic or graphemic distinction between the two types of relative clause, the definite noun phrase denoting only part of the referent (previously mentioned or not) is marked by the employment of the demonstrative pronoun before the definite article. In addition to this, Hungarian also shows agreement in definiteness between the transitive verb and its direct object, a "definite" noun (phrase) object requiring the use of the definite conjugation, the indefinite conjugation being used otherwise. The feature of totality was shown to have an important bearing structurally in the aspects of definiteness discussed so far in this study. Consequently, it may be more accurate to reword the above statement and say that a definite and total noun phrase object requires the use of the definite conjugation. This latter statement now remains to be tested in the remaining chapters of Part II.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. If definiteness is not viewed in light of the whole discourse, then such circular (pedagogically motivated?) explanations as the following can intrude in the place of scientific analysis: "Nouns can also be definite (⟨+definite⟩) or (⟨-definite⟩). ... in order to tell whether the common noun "table" is ⟨+definite⟩ or ⟨-definite⟩ we have to look at the article." Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum (1967b:45). "Since the noun is definite (⟨+definite⟩), there is a transformation called the *article transformation* which inserts "the" into the deep structure ... The article transformation depends upon features of the noun, for example, *definiteness* (⟨+definite⟩ or ⟨-definite⟩) ..." *Idem.*, page 46.

2. I owe a great deal of the analysis in this section to Lauri Karttunen (1968b:6-9).

3. For example, see Karttunen (1968a) for a recent discussion of these matters and for a list of works (mostly unpublished) which are pertinent to the discussion here.

4. This type of "previous mention" is listed as category (iii) in Karttunen's list of discourse situations in which definitization may take place without overt prior mention (1968a:13). Since this type of definitization does occur in a "linguistic context," that is, a referent for the definite noun phrase is overtly mentioned in some manner in the discourse, I am including it under "previous mention," although it may require a great deal of philosophizing to draw any sort of dividing line between previous mention and situational identification in such cases.

5. Non-restrictive clauses are characterized by *open juncture*, which sets them apart from the rest of the utterance in speech. Traditional orthography reflects this fairly consistently by setting off such clauses by the use of commas. This practice, of course, will be followed here. Restrictive clauses are characterized by *closed juncture* in speech and the lack of commas in writing.

6. The distinction between an "introductory" indefinite noun phrase, e.g., *a man* of b.1 (i.e., *a certain man*) and an "unspecified" indefinite noun phrase, e.g., *a speaker* (i.e., *any speaker* of the stated qualifications), although vital structurally in both English and Hungarian, will be ignored here for the time being. We have already shown above why, in fact, a restrictive clause cannot modify *a speaker* here, for the same semantic or logical considerations which militate against definitizing a noun phrase for which no discourse referent has actually been established, also militate against the use of an appositive clause with a noun phrase which is not a proper discourse referent.

7. While up to this point in our exposition of definiteness, we have dealt primarily with noun phrases which have the definite article as their determiner, this statement holds true

for *all* definite noun phrases of whatever construction type. In 2.3 we have already alluded to the way this aspect of definiteness affects the behavior of proper nouns, and in the following chapters all of the other types of noun phrases considered "definite" in either language will be dealt with.

8. For the reader who is not familiar with the indefinite and definite conjugational endings in Hungarian, the following (back-vowel) paradigm (present indicative) is given:

	Indefinite conjugation			Definite conjugation		
1.	látok	látunk	'I see,' etc.	látom	látjuk	'I see
2.	látsz	láttok		látod	látjátok	(it),'
3.	lát	látnak		látja	látják	etc.

Other phonologically or morphologically based variations are possible, but they need not concern us at the moment.

9. The (overtly definite) construction *the newspaper of today* is also a possible (formal?) alternate here; but, inasmuch as it is construed as generic, it does not readily pattern with the present continuous tense, nor, in fact, does it readily occur as a direct object. The preferred position of generics of this type in English seems to be the subject position. "The newspaper of today is larger and more informative than the newspaper of 30 years ago," seems to be quite acceptable, while "People aren't reading the newspaper of today as much as they did the newspaper of 30 years ago," seems less acceptable. Stylistics may play a role here too, of course, but any further analysis along these lines would lead us too far afield.

10. The examples used in this paragraph are taken from, or based on sentences found in Koutsoudas (1968a:4).

11. Since there are four readily movable syntactic elements in these sentences, namely, three noun phrases and a verb, there are naturally other combinations possible in addition to the six given here. These other possible constructions reflect differences in emphasis and add no more essential information to the matter at hand than the above examples. However, since a knowledge of stress and word-order phenomena are crucial for a fuller understanding of Hungarian, such variations will be discussed quite extensively in Chapter XVIII.

CHAPTER V

ANAPHORIC DEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

5.0 Introduction

The place of pronouns within the category of definiteness has never been clearly defined, to my knowledge, for either English or Hungarian. For the most part the connections made between pronoun usage and definitization have been only marginal.[1] We have previously cited a statement (Fillmore 1964:96) to the effect that "definite pronouns" are not attached to restrictive clauses in English. However, the question as to what pronouns are "definite" is not answered, this being beside the main point being discussed in the article cited. Nor, of course, are the corollary questions that follow answered: 1) What pronouns are indefinite? 2) What is the structural significance of such a categorization of the pronouns? and 3) What, in short, is the place of pronouns in the broad category of definiteness? These questions will be dealt with from the point of view of English first of all, then from the Hungarian standpoint by way of contrast. Accordingly, we will attempt to answer the latter all-embracing question by drawing together relevant items of information relating to English pronominalization and definitization, by expanding on them wherever necessary, then relating these findings to the parallel situations in Hungarian. A useful procedure here, I believe, would be to view pronominal forms of all kinds in the light of what we have already said is the fundamental basis of the broad structural category of definiteness, and thus to determine the definite or indefinite status of each pronoun type. We shall proceed by determining, if we can, what makes definite pronouns definite and conclude by outlining the structural consequences of such definitization. Now that we have determined what the essential elements relating to the process of the definitization of a noun phrase are, it would seem to be a relatively simple matter to apply this yardstick in investigating the definitization of pronouns, inasmuch as the standard definition of pronoun includes the fact that this form class "is used as a substitute for a noun or noun equivalent."[2] By using, then, the criterion that a noun phrase is made definite through mention in prior discourse or through the broad "context," i.e., the entire situation in which the discourse is taking place, we may now test various types of pronouns to determine their relationship to definiteness and their concomitant patterning with other elements in the discourse.

5.1 Anaphoric pronouns

In paragraph 4.1.2 what we had labelled "the optional use of the definite article after previous mention" is actually the anaphoric use of a pronoun, that is, the (optional) replacement of an entire noun phrase by a single form traditionally called a "pronoun," a "definite pronoun" in this case, inasmuch as the definite noun phrase or its replacement represents the totality of the referent. We said further that, if there is no ambiguity in the discourse context, that is, if there is only one referent in the prior discourse to which an anaphoric pronoun may "logically" or grammatically refer, then the pronominalization is more or less obligatory in the spoken standard in English, while in parallel constructions in Hungarian the total noun phrase deletion coupled with the absence of the pronoun is the rule in non-contrastive, non-emphatic sentences. Consider again the examples given in the paragraph cited above:

a. 1. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. The woman told me a sad story.
   2. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. She told me a sad story.

b. 1. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. A nő elmondott egy szomorú történetet.
   2. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Ő elmondott egy szomorú történetet.
   3. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Elmondott egy szomorú történetet.

There can be little doubt that she (together with its Hungarian equivalent) is a "definite (and total) pronoun,"[3] since it directly replaces a clearly definite noun phrase.[4] Native speakers apprehend that she is as definite as the woman in such a discourse situation. However, to test the definiteness of such a pronoun as she by other means is rather difficult. Applying, for example, the structural criterion of collocatability with restrictive or non-restrictive relative clauses leads us no further in this test since pronouns of the total-anaphoric type do not seem to pattern with either type of relative clause, not even a repetitive one which reiterates the identifying context of the prior discourse.[5]

5.1.1 Hungarian anaphoric pronouns or their substitutes as subjects. In 4.1.2 above we gave several examples which indicate that in many respects the employment of an anaphoric pronoun in Hungarian--in subject position at least--is quite similar to the corresponding process in English, with the additional factor that Hungarian has the option of deleting the pronoun in non-ambiguous, non-emphatic contexts. Accordingly, the English sentence a.1 has two common equivalents in Hungarian:

a. 1. *She* (or *he*) told me a sad story.
2. Ő elmondott nekem egy szomorú történetet.
3. Elmondott nekem egy szomorú történetet.

Similarly: b. 1. They were very interesting. (i.e., *the men*)
2. Ők nagyon érdekesek voltak. (also *azok*)
3. Nagyon érdekesek voltak.

and with "neuter," i.e., non-personal reference:

c. 1. It was new. (i.e., *the table*)
2. Az új volt.
3. Új volt.

d. 1. They are quite new. (e.g., *the tables*)
2. Azok elég újak.
3. ?Elég újak.

The last Hungarian sentence is marked "questionable." Since equational sentences already call for a deletion, namely, the copula, when the subject is in the third person, deleting the subject in addition, as in this example, is felt to be too much truncation. However, apart from the fact, then, that Hungarian grammar (inconsistently) distinguishes only personal vs. non-personal gender in the third person singular and plural, while English has a three-way gender distinction in the singular but none in the plural, the main point of difference in anaphoric *subject* pronouns in the two languages is the fact that the pronoun in Hungarian is largely optional since--as in Spanish and many other languages--the verb is unambiguously conjugated for person and number. Therefore, the structural possibilities for testing the status of definiteness of a Hungarian subject pronoun are considerably reduced. We have already seen that in Hungarian "definite" noun phrases cannot be tested for scale of definiteness by the touchstone of collocatability with relative clauses since there is no apparent distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses, total or partial reference in that language being signaled by the determiner before the definitized noun phrase. Accordingly, one would expect at least a change in pronoun form to signal, when necessary, the difference between total definite and partial definite pronouns. Such is the case. First of all, this "difference in form" may be zero, that is, the very absence of a possible anaphoric pronoun in Hungarian is a signal that (unemphatic) total reference is meant.[6] This is necessarily so with singular reference, of course, and is, by convention, true for the plural also:

e. 1. He was very intelligent.
   2. Nagyon intelligens volt.

f. 1. They are very intelligent and interesting.
   2. Nagyon intelligensek és érdekesek.

By convention, then, the anaphoric pronouns are not deleted unless unemphatic total-definite reference is intended. Speaker and hearer know exactly who or what is being referred to, once the introductory statement has been made. Emphatic (or contrastive) total reference, however, must be signaled by the employment of the overt anaphoric pronoun *ő* in the singular or by various emphatic total forms in the plural:

g. 1. *She* is very intelligent.
   2. *O* nagyon intelligens.

h. 1. *They* are *all* very interesting.
   2. *Mindnyájan* nagyon érdekesek.

Partial reference, on the other hand, as in English must be shown by a change in form other than zero:

i. 1. Those who were intelligent were interesting.
   2. Azok, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek (is) voltak.

Other construction types are possible, of course, which convey the same indications of partial reference in addition to the "principal" lexical information of the sentence:

88

j. 1. Some (of them) were intelligent and interesting.
2. Valamelyikiik intelligensek és érdekesek voltak.

We can see from the sentences in e. and f. that while patterning with relative clauses is not possible with the total-anaphoric pronouns in either language under discussion here, it is possible with partial-anaphoric ("partial-definite") pronouns in either language. This does require a change in pronoun form, however, in addition to the ability to pattern in this way. We can see that the same Hungarian form, *azok*, is a marker of partial definiteness in both noun phrase and pronoun constructions, while in English *those* may be employed in parallel constructions. Up to this point, then, the structural test for definiteness of Hungarian anaphoric pronouns used as subjects is, in a sense, negative, i.e., the pronouns may be deleted if they represent the totality of the referent, or they may be replaced by other conventional forms, if they do not. Hungarian, however, has still another structural correlate which indicates clearly the definite status of anaphoric pronouns which are used as direct objects, namely the patterning with the definite conjugation. We shall now proceed to examine this grammatical occurrence more closely.

5.1.2 *Hungarian total anaphoric pronouns or substitutes as direct objects.* As we have previously mentioned, definite noun phrases used as direct objects in Hungarian require the use of the definite conjugation. It follows then that total anaphoric pronouns which replace definite noun phrases also govern the definite conjugation. However, just as in the case of the subject pronouns, the use of the total-definite object pronouns in Hungarian is confined largely to emphatic or contrastive utterances since the verb form is now unambiguously marked for definiteness of object. Also as in the case of the Hungarian subject pronouns which we have dealt with above, we may go directly from an indefinite noun phrase referent to zero as object, or from a definite one, or one could conceivably observe a discourse situation in which the definitization proceeds from an indefinite noun phrase through all the intermediate stages of definitization, pronominalization, and reduction:

a. 1.	(Speaker A) Látok egy embert.	I see a man.
2.	(B) Én is látom az embert.	I see the man too.
3.	(A) Őt nem ismerem.	I don't know him.
4.	(B) Én sem ismerem.	I don't know him either.

Other dialogs of this type may be "more natural" with either one of the intermediate steps illustrated in a.2 and a.3 omitted. However, the above sentences illustrate fairly accurately the maximum number of steps which may be taken in this process. A "more natural" sequence of definitization shows a direct transition from an indefinite or definite noun phrase to a deleted total "pronoun" object:

b. 1. Látok egy embert, de nem ismerem.
2. I see a man, but I don't know him.

c. 1. Már megkóstoltad a kávét?
2. Igen, de nem szeretem.
3. Did you taste the coffee yet?
4. Yes, but I don't like it.

Further reductions are also possible in a more explicit or basic type of discourse, in which case English may also delete the object pronoun, but only if accompanied by the main verb:

d. 1. Szereted a kávét?
2. (Igen), szeretem.
3. Do you like the coffee? (or: Do you like coffee?)
4. Yes, I do (like it).

These and similar reductions are extensive enough to warrant a fuller discussion which will have to be deferred at this time.

5.2 *Contrasts in anaphoric pronoun usage*

Having once formulated the hypothesis that there is a syntactic feature of totality that pervades the whole category of definiteness in both English and Hungarian, we may now test this hypothesis with anaphoric pronouns in order to determine what syntactic or formal correlates, if any, are associated with totality of referent in contrast to partial reference. We have indicated in several places above that if an indefinite noun phrase has a singular referent, then the definite pronoun "replacing" it must, of necessity, be "total-anaphoric." When, on the other hand, there is a discourse referent which includes more than one item, then the possible contrast between totality and partiality is, in turn, an all-pervading and indispensable factor in the category of definiteness. Accordingly, the following sentences, which contain plural or collective referents, may serve to illustrate the role of totality as concerns anaphoric object pronouns in both of the languages being discussed here:

a. 1. There are (some) cups on the kitchen table.
   2. Please bring *them* to me.
   3. Csészék vannak a konyhaasztalon. (or: Néhány csésze van ...)
   4. Kérlek hozd ide nekem (*azokat*).

b. 1. Please bring me *one* (*of them*). (or: ... *one of them* to me.)
   2. Kérlek hozz ide *egyet belőle*/*belőlük*.

c. 1. Please bring *some* (*of them*) to me. (or: ... me *some*.)
   2. Kérlek hozz *néhányat belőle*/*belőlük*.

In the above examples we see illustrated an important feature of anaphoric pronoun usage in Hungarian, namely, that the deletion of the definite pronoun in Hungarian is the rule when *all* of the referent is being referred to in subsequent discourse, the definiteness of the object being clearly marked by the definite conjugation endings. When part of the referent is being referred to, then a partial-anaphoric pronoun, for example, *egy* or *valamennyi*, is employed in conjunction with the indefinite conjugation. In addition to the foregoing specific observation, the sample sentences above offer an illustration of the general ability of the *difference* in the sets of conjugational endings *alone* to furnish the contrast necessary in Hungarian for differentiating between totality and partiality of reference. This contrastive ability is clearly exemplified in the use of the anaphoric pronoun *valamennyi*, which is ambiguous, its full meaning being dependent on the conjugation type with which it occurs. As an object of a verb in the indefinite conjugation, as in 2.c above, *valamennyi* is a partial-anaphoric (or, traditionally, "indefinite") pronoun; as an object of a verb with definite endings, it is a total-anaphoric (or "definite") pronoun. Thus, a contrast in meaning shown by conjugational endings alone is quite simple to illustrate with this anaphoric pronoun:

d. 1. Hoz*d* ide valamennyit (nekem).
   2. Bring them (all) to me.

e. 1. Hoz*zál* ide valamennyit (nekem).
   2. Bring some (of them) to me.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. The only exception to this statement that I know of is Postal (1966), where it is argued that definite pronouns are actually definite articles.

2. Webster's Third New International Dictionary, page 1816 b-c. Whether the structurally ambiguous part of this definition is to be read as "... or for a noun equivalent" or "... or as a noun equivalent" makes little difference in our analysis here.

3. In our discussion here of previous mention or previous-mention "replacement" we are, of course, not ruling out the fact that such pronouns as she may be also situationally identified. It is not difficult to think of a situation, for example, where she is actually deictic, that is to say, replaces a demonstrative in such a sentence as "That woman dances well," spoken by a person pointing to an individual on a dance floor. "She dances well" would be equally well understood in such a situation, even without prior discourse of any kind. The same applies to the form she which is employed to designate a non-human object to which a personal attachment may be felt. For example, "She's a good ship" and "How's she running?" uttered in the presence of a ship and an automobile, respectively, are perfectly acceptable introductory sentences in a discourse. The she of "There she goes!" may be multiply ambiguous, the discourse situation clearly indicating whether someone or something is passing by, or whether a house is collapsing or what not. Except for this brief mention, such "marginal" forms as the above will have to be left out of consideration here. Although only nominative forms of the pronouns will be given here in these examples, what is said in regard to definiteness of pronouns applies, of course, to all case forms of the pronoun in question.

4. I use the traditional term replaces in spite of Postal's flippant comment (1966:198-9): "The idea that a form like she in sentences such as she dances well is a 'replacement' or 'substitute' for some other noun, say in 'discourse contexts' or the like, seems to me completely without basis. Such an assumption explains nothing for the quite simple reason that there is nothing to explain. It is quite sufficient to indicate precisely that such forms refer to object-types whose particular referents are assumed by the speaker to be known to the person spoken to." The latter sentence of this quotation sounds like my own definition of situational identification. However, when in a particular utterance the form a woman, for example, is introduced into the discourse, and this is followed by occurrences of she, understood by speaker and hearer to refer to the same individual, then it seems this relationship should be stated by the linguist.

5. There is no doubt that in some literary styles he and the other "definite" pronouns of the third person can indeed pattern with relative clauses. This is particularly true in regard to older translations of the Bible, but this phenomenon is common in other types of writing as well. Typical biblical quotations

are: "And he who saw it has borne witness, and his witness is true" (John 19,35); and "... and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband" (John 4,18). An example from expository prose is "Talking is often just a game, but a game is only worthwhile if he who plays the game sticks to the rules" (Martinet 1962:139). The last occurrence of he here is, strictly speaking, an example of "indefinite" he who, which is the equivalent of whoever or anyone who. The first two instances, on the other hand, are partial anaphoric and equivalent to the one who.

6. "Impersonal" verbs in Hungarian as, for example, esik, 'it's raining,' dörög, 'it's thundering,' etc., also have a zero subject, of course. These verbs, however, may be analyzed as "indefinite" for semantic reasons, if for no other reason.

CHAPTER VI

NON-ANAPHORIC DEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

6.0 Introduction

As discussed above, anaphoric pronouns are, by definition, of the third person, inasmuch as they replace a previously-mentioned noun phrase. It was also stated that if such a pronoun represents the totality of the referent, then the anaphoric pronoun is "definite;" if, on the other hand, it represents only part of the entities included in the antecedent, then it is a "partial-definite" pronoun, which traditionally has been lumped together with "indefinite" pronouns. It follows then that the pronouns of the first and second persons are not anaphoric since they obviously do not replace any previously-mentioned noun phrase. Consequently, neither the traditional label "pronoun" nor the structural label "substitution type" is appropriate, strictly speaking. However, if we leave terminological questions aside and continue to use the traditional terms, it still remains to be examined how these pronouns come to be definite, if indeed they are definite in English or Hungarian.

6.1 English pronouns of the first and second person

As we examine the English forms, it would be very tempting, indeed, to label the non-anaphoric pronouns I, we and you "proper nouns" since they--within a given utterance, of course--fit the dictionary definition of this noun type: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing, does not take a limiting modifier and is usu. capitalized in English" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary:1818). The pronoun I, of course, fits this definition on all three accounts, but when one applies the structural test of collocatability with restrictive clauses, it becomes quite apparent that the first person singular pronoun does not (?) pattern with either a restrictive or a non-restrictive clause, which is not true of traditional proper nouns, or of indefinite pronouns, for that matter. Thus while a.1 below is possible, a.2 is unacceptable, while a.3 is doubtful:

a. 1. Mary Smith, who is a friend of mine, will be there.
   2. *I, who am her friend, will be there.
   3. ?I who am her friend will be there.

If one finds a.3 unacceptable--as I do--then one can conclude that _I_ is definite, as definite, structurally speaking, as the traditionally recognized definite pronouns of the third person, even though it cannot be a substitute for a previously-mentioned noun phrase. If a.3 is acceptable, then _I_ is as indefinite structurally as _someone_, _something_ and other independent indefinite pronouns. This leaves us with an anomaly, of course, for there is hardly any other linguistic form which could be considered to be "more definite" through situational identification, even though one recognizes the fact that this pronoun can have an unstable referent from one sentence to the next. However, for each sentence uttered, speaker and hearer obviously know what individual is the referent for each given occurrence of the pronoun. Since _I_ is singular, it is necessarily "total;" consequently, no question of partiality vs. totality can arise. However, in the case of _we_ and _you_, there is, of course, room for ambiguity in this regard. For one thing, patterning with non-restrictive or restrictive clauses seems to be possible in standard English. Patterning with restrictive clauses, of course, implies a contrast with other persons not included in the qualification. This is the partitive relation once again, as can be seen from the following:

b. 1. You, who are my friends, will understand this.
   2. You who are my friends understand me.

There are, of course, numerous instances where speakers do not employ differences in clause type to show contrast or unambiguity in number reference, and it is interesting to observe what devices are employed in English to resolve or prevent such ambiguity, which, as is well known, does not arise in many languages, because of the greater variety of pronominal forms. It is, for example, a well-known fact that, while English and Hungarian possess only one first plural subject pronoun form, other languages may employ an "exclusive" or "inclusive" form, or a dual or trial number, etc., concepts which may easily be paraphrased in English or Hungarian when speakers feel such a distinction is necessary. The "inclusive" first person plural, for example, may be merely replaced in English by you and I (both), while we both, we two, we three, the two of us, etc., may be less ambiguous in a given discourse situation than the unsupported pronoun. Other types of reinforcement (or qualification) are possible, of course. A very frequent type is we + noun, usually in overt contradistinction to you + noun, we Americans vs. you Frenchmen, for example, (but not *they Germans, and the like). However, it seems that no matter how the first person plural pronoun form is reinforced (or qualified), it still patterns as either definite or indefinite by the structural measures employed here, for example:

c. 1. We, (who are) the best chess players in the USA, should be able to beat this boy.
   2. We who have tickets are lucky.

The latter sentence is also an example of partial reference from a stated or tacitly understood totality. It is further quite evident that many native speakers of English are conscientiously aware of the number ambiguity of the second person pronouns, which, of course, does not arise in many other languages, because of available plural forms. This is clearly evidenced by the widespread use of such forms as you all (y'all), you folks, you people, etc., employed as unambiguous plural forms. Likewise, attitudes of endearment and the like, on the one hand, and scorn and the like on the other, both of which are possible to express in other languages through the selection of "familiar" forms of address in contrast to "formal" types, may be expressed by reinforcing elements in English, if the need is felt: you dear, you genius, etc., on the one hand, vs. you fool, you dope, etc., on the other. However, just as was the case with we, this type of modification of the second person pronoun in English does not seem to affect the structural status of the pronoun, which must, accordingly, be considered to be "total definite," through situational identification if there is no qualification present to imply partial reference. It will be noted that this is the same syntactic behavior exhibited by common nouns in this regard. However, this parallelism cannot be carried too far.

6.2 First and "second" person pronouns in Hungarian

The situation with regard to the first and "second" person pronoun forms in Hungarian is even more complicated, for there is not only differentiation in number or social status, and the like, but also anomalies in grammatical person, and in definiteness as well. These are in addition to the fact discussed above that Hungarian pronominal forms--both subject and object forms--tend to be deleted in unambiguous, non-emphatic utterances.

6.2.1 *Familiar forms*. The semantic (or social) implications of the second person "familiar" forms in Hungarian need not concern us here at the moment, since the various "meanings" of these forms do not seem to affect their structural status, which is what we shall now proceed to examine. Although they are non-anaphoric, the subject forms, *te* and *ti*, seem to have the same syntactic properties as the definite pronouns which we have previously examined; that is, they show the same behavior with respect to occurrence with restrictive clauses and to possibilities for deletion. The object forms of these second person pronouns--as well as those of the first person--on the other hand, behave differently from the third person forms in regard to their status in the category of definiteness. The object forms of the first and second persons, *engem*(*et*), *minket*/*benünket*, and *téged*(*et*), *titeket*/*benneteket*, respectively, govern the indefinite, not the definite conjugation, as indicated in the following paradigm:

a. Pista látja őt. Steve sees him.
but: b. Pista lát engem. Steve sees me.
and c. Pista lát téged. Steve sees you.
just as d. Pista lát valakit. Steve sees someone.

Since the plural forms of these pronouns behave in the same fashion as their respective singulars, the paradigm need not be extended to include them. The question remains, however, as to how one is to explain this divergent behavior of the first and second person pronouns. Some of the analytic difficulty may be resolved by simply stating that these pronouns are indefinite in their subject forms as well as in their object forms, although this would be difficult to demonstrate by our structural tests. The other discrepancy, that of the indefiniteness of the first and second person forms vs. the definiteness of the third, is also difficult to account for synchronically, but may be analyzed transformationally by the simple statement embodied in an ordering rule valid for object pronouns, at least: Definitization precedes pronominalization. Therefore, a sequence such as in e. is required (at least hypothetically):

e.	1. Egy ember megy.	A man is going.
	2. Pista lát*ja* *az* embert.	Steve sees the man.
	3. Pista lát*ja* őt.	Steve sees him.
or:	4. Pista lát*ja*.	Steve sees him.

This sequence can apply, of course, only to third person forms, since the first and second persons, by definition, have no noun phrase referents in prior discourse which can be made definite or pronominalized. Postulating a sequence such as the above, however, does not explain why the subject forms of the first and second persons seem to behave the same way structurally as the third person forms, unless, of course, one were to regard the occurrence before various verb forms appended with different (i.e., non-third person) personal suffixes as sufficient motivation for stating that *all* of the subject personal pronouns behave differently from each other syntactically--even in regard to the category of definiteness. However, there is much to be said for treating the first and second person pronouns together as belonging to a syntactic category different from that of the third person pronouns. In other words, the syntactic opposition is between the singular first or second person pronoun--patterning with various personal verbal suffixes--on the one hand, and the third person--with zero in the indefinite conjugation, at least--on the other, the situation in the plural being considered an analogical extension of this phenomenon. Zero verbal suffix and zero pronoun subject are possible, then, only in those situations where the subjects are anaphoric (or, of course, clearly deictic). In other situations the suffixes of the first or second persons will perforce be employed.[1] The same sort of rule prevails, then, with the object pronouns of the first and second person singular, engem(et) and téged(et); in this case, however, the endings of the different conjugation types mark the anaphoric or non-anaphoric nature of the deleted pronoun object. Thus, the definite object + zero object can be employed anaphorically only,[2] that is, with a third-person referent already having been mentioned. Conversely, the indefinite conjugation + zero object marks the deletion of first or second person pronoun forms, the discourse situation clearly indicating which person is meant (otherwise the unambiguous object pronoun forms are necessarily used). In this manner, then, a whole array of unambiguous subject and object pronoun deletions are possible, depending on the discourse situation, in which the anaphoric or non-anaphoric nature of the deleted forms is known. A paradigm illustrating this will be given after the following discussion of the "implicative" forms.

6.2.1.1 Forms denoting "I subject - you object." A much-discussed non-anaphoric deletion of both subject pronoun and object pronoun is found in the use of the "implicative"[3] (-lak/-lek) forms. This portmanteau suffix indicates a first person singular subject and a second person "familiar" object, either singular or plural. The singular object is marked in this particular case by this unique suffix plus zero, the plural by the same suffix plus the second person plural object pronoun. The use of this incorporating suffix is another example of unambiguous object deletion or the use of zero in non-emphatic or non-contrastive utterances, since in situations requiring emphasis of some kind, the proper object (or even subject) pronoun may be used as an intensifier. Thus, a discourse may be unambiguously initiated with, for example, this non-anaphoric form: *Szeretlek* 'I love you.' Furthermore, since, as we have seen, the use of the indefinite conjugational endings with zero object clearly indicates the deletion of a non-third person object form, the obverse subject-object relation may be unambiguously expressed by the verb alone with both subject and object pronouns deleted. Thus, a discourse may be initiated with simply a verb form such as *Szeretsz*? 'Do you love me?' since the second-person subject verbal suffix is unambiguous, and the use of the indefinite conjugation + zero clearly indicates that a non-third person (non-reflexive) object form has been deleted. In fact, as previously indicated, the overt use of a personal pronoun in such unambiguous instances does imply emphasis, deletion being more common in non-emphatic discourse, for example::|

a.	1. Szeretsz?	Do you love me?
	2. Igen, szeretlek.	Yes, I do.

A great deal has been written in regard to the actual place of the -*lak*/-*lek* suffix in the Hungarian conjugational system, and although there is at least one pedagogical grammar of Hungarian which takes no stand on the issue,[4] the usual grammar labels -*lak*/-*lek* as a special suffix of the definite conjugation. Without getting too involved in this (mainly terminological) question here, it might be mentioned that both from the morphological as well as from the syntactic point of view it is difficult to understand the motivation behind the notion that this suffix belongs in the definite conjugation. The contrary view has been, in my opinion, definitively presented in at least two formal articles (Lotz 1962 and Keresztes 1965) which require no further elaboration here. It should be pointed out here, however, that just as the definite conjugation does not occur with a second-person object, neither does the regular indefinite conjugational form of the first person singular occur with a second person form as sole object either:

b. 1. *Janos teged(et) latja.   John sees you.
   2. *En teged(et) latom.   I see you.

c. 1. *En teged(et) latok.   I see you.
   2. *En titeket latok.   I see you (pl.).

6.2.1.2 Possible deletions of first and second person object pronouns. We briefly indicated above that the contrast in Hungarian conjugational endings alone is exploited to indicate the person of the object in perhaps most utterances in connected discourse. The skeletal dialog given above: "Szeretsz? Szeretlek." is but the briefest example of an almost endless variety of possible discourse situations in which the situation itself clearly indicates whether the speaker or hearer is meant as the object of the transitive verb with indefinite endings but with no overt object. This includes, of course, verbs with either second or third person endings in the case of the first person object, and first person (plural) and third person endings in the case of the second.[5] Thus, narrative sentences such as:

a. 1. Pista nyitott ajtót, és örömmel udvözölt.
   2. Steve opened the door and greeted (me) happily.

can "logically" have only a first person object, the prior context supplying the information necessary for precluding the interpretation of a second person object. Similarly, the common formula "Hogy hívnak?" may, of course, have either a first or second person as object of the verb. However, the discourse situation in which the formula occurs clearly indicates whether or not the remote possibility of a first person object is intended. An unambiguous deletion of the first person object pronoun *engem* may naturally follow a previous occurrence of the pronoun, as in the line from a Hungarian folksong:

b. 1. Öleljen meg engem, aki szeret. (Bánhidi et al. 1965:199)
2. Hug me, whoever loves (me).

Finally, it must be mentioned that such deletions may be perfectly clear as to person, but may be ambiguous as to number. This ambiguity may be resolved by the use of the appropriate object pronoun, of course, but need not be, as in certain instances the notion of number is unimportant:

c. 1. Holnap meglátogathatnál. (Báti and Véges 1966:251)
2. You might come to visit me/us tomorrow.

6.2.2 *"Formal" forms of address*. The discussion above relating to the "second person" pronouns had to do with clear-cut cases of "semantic" as well as "grammatical" second person, i.e., with both distinctive pronoun forms as well as verbal suffixes employed when addressing one's "familiar" hearer(s). What was not included in the discussion was the phenomenon of "polite" or "formal" forms of address in Hungarian, which for a variety of structural reasons must be analyzed as *third person*, even though one traditionally tends to label as "second person" those pronominal forms associated with the person(s) addressed regardless of the structural implications involved in such classification. Thus, *maga* and *ön*, and their plural forms, *maguk* and *önök* show third-person characteristics when considered from at least the following points of view.

6.2.2.1 *Morphological considerations*. The first obvious point in the consideration of the place of *maga* and *ön* in the grammatical system of Hungarian is the fact that these forms morphologically behave as nouns, *maga* having the characteristics of a noun in the possessive, *ön* those of a common noun stem. Therefore, while the "familiar" second person nominative and accusative pronouns (as well as the first person forms) synchronically form their plurals by suppletion: *te/ti*, *téged/titeket* or *benneteket* (also *én/mi*, *engem/minket* or *bennünket*), the formal forms--as well as the third person pronoun *ő*--undergo pluralization by regular substantival suffixation: *maga/maguk*,[6] *ön/önök*. Furthermore, as is well known, these latter forms as subjects take the same personal verbal suffixes as other nouns, common or proper:

a. 1. Maga (or Ön) elmegy holnap. You are leaving tomorrow.
just as: 2. Pista elmegy holnap. Steve is leaving tomorrow.
3. A lány elmegy holnap. The girl is leaving tomorrow.

Other (syntactically-motivated) morphological considerations relating to the "polite" forms will be discussed below in the section on reflexives.

6.2.2.2 *Syntactic considerations*. One important syntactic consideration relating to the formal forms which must be considered is the fact that, unlike the familiar form *te*, *maga* and *ön* are, in some measure, anaphoric as they can replace formal address forms consisting of, for example, occupational titles, in addition to other social forms, such as *tanár* *úr* (lit.) 'Mr. Teacher,' *igazgató* *úr* 'Mr. Director' and the like. These forms, of course, require third-person subject-object agreement, just as any other third-person form, and govern the definite conjugation when used as the direct object. Accordingly, we may have a three-way choice of polite forms of address ranging from noun phrase to pronoun to zero, just as in the case of pronominalization occurring with any other noun phrase:

a. 1. *Tanár* *úr* le tetszik ülni? — Would you care to sit down, professor?
2. *Önnek* le tetszik ülni? — Would you care to sit down?
3. Le tetszik ülni? — Would you care to sit down?

The same range of choices is open, of course, in instances where the polite forms are direct objects:

b. 1. Tanár urat hall*om*. — I hear you, professor.
2. Önt hall*om*. — I hear you (sir).
3. Hall*om*. — I hear you.

6.2.2.3 *Sociological* *considerations* *for* *deletions*. Because of the fact that the proper selection of an appropriate form of address often poses an unsolvable social dilemma in some instances in Hungarian, a common practice in more formal conversational situations is to avoid, as much as possible, the use of a pronoun altogether. This can be readily achieved by the use of the third person verbal suffixes with zero in the case of "formal" subject, and the definite conjugation with zero in cases where the formal form is the object. It is obvious, then, that in the use of the definite conjugation with zero object, the ambiguity which results is between the formal forms and a definite object of the traditional third person. This is in contrast to the ambiguity in the use of the indefinite conjugation and zero, the ambiguity arising in this instance between the first and second person objects. For example, while we have seen that the formula "Hogy hívnak" may possibly have either a first or second person object, the definite form of the same formula limits the number of possible objects to either "third person" or "formal." Thus, "Hogy hívják" translates into "What is your name?" or any other third person possibility: "What is his/her/their name(s)?" However, since, as we have seen, such a deletion of the third person object generally takes place only when the object is total anaphoric, that is, only when there is a previously-mentioned referent in mind, there is in actual practice comparatively little ambiguity occurring in regular discourse. Extensive conversations are carried out quite successfully with the use of the non-committal "zero form of address" in the place of an overt, possibly awkward form of address.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. The impersonal verbs alluded to in footnote six of the previous chapter again form an exception to this statement.

2. Actually, the pronouns maga and ön may be "understood" in certain instances. These pronouns and their plural forms will be discussed below, and will be treated as third-person forms, since, among other things, they can be anaphoric in a sense, and also govern third-person verbal forms, and not the second-person ones.

3. This term was coined by Lotz (1962).

4. Bánhidi et al. (1965:194) simply call this suffix "a special verb form."

5. Third-person objects may be deleted after verbs in the indefinite conjugation also, but these are partial-anaphoric, i.e., partitives, and will be discussed further below in 6.2.2.2.

6. Maguk, of course, is marked for plural possessor, and not plural possessed.

CHAPTER VII

REFLEXIVE AND DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

7.0 Introduction

The reflexive pronouns in both of the languages being analyzed here pose a special problem in that they have the characteristics of nouns and anaphoric pronouns at the same time. In addition, they pattern as clear-cut definite pronouns in all persons, even though, as was shown above, the first and second person object pronouns at least are considered indefinite in Hungarian by the structural test of government of the definite conjugation just as do indefinite noun phrases or indefinite pronouns. The demonstrative pronouns, on the other hand, pose problems because of the varying patterning in Hungarian, and because of the extensive uses of the English forms. We shall examine each type separately here.

7.1 Reflexive pronouns

Upon examining the morphological structure of the reflexive pronouns in both English and Hungarian, one is struck by the fact that these "pronouns" are actually nouns, possessive nouns in fact, which are used in special ways. The English forms, for example, form a fairly complete possessive paradigm in most standard forms: *myself*, *yourself*, *herself*, *ourselves*, and *yourselves*. *Itself* is undoubtedly a reduction of *its* + *self*, while the substandard analogical formations *hisself* and *theirselves* clearly indicate that the formal correlation between the reflexive and possessive forms is strongly felt by many native speakers of English. Furthermore, as Postal pointed out (1966:182), the form *self* can occur both free or as a stem with noun suffixes, e.g., -*less* and -*ish*. The Hungarian reflexive forms likewise exhibit noun endings, the endings of its paradigm being almost isomorphic with the possessive endings on back-vowel nouns, *ház* 'house,' for example:

	reflexive		possessive	
1.	magam	'myself,' etc.	házam	'my house,' etc.
2.	magad		házad	
3.	maga		háza	
1.	magunk		házunk	
2.	magatok		házotok	
3.	maguk		házuk	

Since the reflexive pronouns in Hungarian are, morphologically speaking, possessive nouns, their definiteness may be explained in the same manner that the definiteness of possessive nouns in general is analyzed (see Chapter XI). However, there is naturally more to reflexive pronouns than just their noun nature in either English or Hungarian. This is their status as anaphoric pronouns, which we shall now proceed to discuss.

7.1.1 *Anaphoric nature of reflexives*. Although we have seen that personal pronouns can be anaphoric, i.e., can replace a previously-mentioned noun phrase, only in the third person by definition, the reflexive pronouns are anaphoric in all persons by definition. In fact, they are obligatory replacements of object forms whenever the referents of the subject and of the object are identical. Thus, a.1 and b.1 are *possible* only if there are two identically-named individuals in question, and a.2 and b.2 are *possible* only if there are two different (male) beings in question, while a.3 and b.3 are *obligatory* if one and the same individual is meant as subject and object:[1]

a. 1. John sees John in the mirror.
2. John sees him in the mirror.
3. John sees himself in the mirror.

b. 1. János Jánost lát*ja* a tükörben.
2. János őt lát*ja* a tükörben.
3. János magát lát*ja* a tükörben.

By convention, then, the first two sentences in each group are "ungrammatical" if the same individual is meant as both subject and object. This phenomenon parallels the obligatory definitization in subsequent discourse of a noun phrase which has been previously mentioned or is otherwise identified in the discourse situation. In both instances "ungrammaticality" is measured by the effectiveness of communication, that is, by the success of the speaker in making the proper connection between a previously-mentioned noun phrase and forms used subsequently to refer to it. It is in a sense "discourse ungrammaticality" that is being discussed here, since, taken in isolation, all of the sentences in a. and b., for example, are grammatical structurally. However, in respect to "reflexivity," i.e., the identity relation between the subject and object, only the last sentence in each group conveys the proper information and is therefore grammatical in the sense taken here.

7.1.2 *The definite nature of reflexive pronouns*. The definiteness of the English reflexive pronouns seems to follow quite naturally from the definiteness of the pronouns or noun phrases they replace. The Hungarian reflexive pronouns, on the other hand, contrast with their non-reflexive counterparts in that they *all* govern the use of the definite conjugation, while, as we have seen, only the third person personal pronouns--including, of course, the formal forms of address--do so. In regard to the definiteness of the Hungarian reflexives, there seem to be three factors working together simultaneously, none of which is sufficient in itself to assure structural definiteness, namely, 1) previous mention, 2) totality (or "identity") and 3) possessiveness. The last-named factor will be discussed more fully in Chapter XI of this work. However, it may be mentioned here that, like previous mention, it requires the reinforcement of the additional factor of totality before definiteness is assured. Totality, of course, is a feature which also requires an additional feature for definiteness to take place, as with the first and second person pronouns in Hungarian or any number of indefinite pronouns in either language, everyone 'mindenki,' for example. As for the first and second person pronouns in Hungarian, these pronouns collocate with the indefinite conjugation because the definite conjugation is restricted to third-person objects, as we have seen. When one considers the reflexive pronouns, however, it becomes quite apparent that, starting from a basic pattern of subject-verb-object, or equally, subject-object-verb, the occurrence of the object form is a type of previous mention if both the subject and the object are identical. This would lead to definiteness through previous mention plus the feature of totality. Thus, while both object pronouns in a. and b. are total, only magadat is both total and anaphoric, hence definite:

a. 1. János téged lát.
   2. John sees you.

b. 1. Te magadat látod.
   2. You see yourself.

The same holds true, of course, for all reflexives of the first and second persons, singular and plural.

7.2 Reflexive vs. reciprocal pronouns

It seems that the definiteness of the reciprocal pronouns in both English and Hungarian may be explained by a simple extension of the analysis given above, showing the anaphoric nature of the reflexives. In both languages the reciprocal forms are compounds of elements which are widely-used _indefinite_ pronouns (or determiners). Now it must be admitted that it is often a futile exercise to attempt to decompose compounds in a semantically relevant way, but it is nonetheless quite tempting to assume that the combining of indefinite pronoun with indefinite pronoun to form a definite pronoun is not just an arbitrary juxtaposition of forms. It is a phenomenon made possible by the anaphoric nature of the form resulting from this fusion, chemical analogies with the compounds H_2O and NaCl notwithstanding. Therefore, _egymás_ and its English equivalents _one another_ or _each other_ pattern in their respective languages with the other definite pronouns discussed above because as object forms they refer back to the subject, individually, rather than as a group, as is the case with the other reflexives. While other languages often use the same pronominal form to express both the reflexive and the reciprocal relationships, e.g., German _sich_ and Spanish _se_, Hungarian and English keep these relationships separate by distinctive pronouns:

a. 1. A fiatalok szeretik magukat. (also önmagukat)
   2. The young people love themselves.

b. 1. A fiatalok szeretik egymást.
   2. The young people love each other (one another).

It is apparent that the anaphoric relationship plus the feature of totality are sufficient for definitization in the case of both types of pronouns discussed here.

7.3 *Demonstrative pronouns*

Each of the so-called "demonstrative" pronouns in both English and Hungarian, *this*/*that* and *ez*/*az* and their respective inflected forms, is found to have at least two principal uses, deictic and anaphoric, which have a direct bearing on the status of these pronouns in the category of definiteness. We shall discuss these primary uses before proceeding to secondary ones, concentrating our attention on the anaphoric use inasmuch as this has greater ramifications than the first-named use.

7.3.1 *The deictic use*. The first use of the demonstrative pronouns may be called the "real" demonstrative use, the deictic use, in which the concrete, real-world object being referred to is in sight of the speaker and hearer, and may be singled out by being pointed at, touched, lifted, etc. A demonstrative pronoun used in this way illustrates a case of situational identification *par excellence*, and, if total, must certainly be analyzed as definite. Several examples of this use will be given here, where the proximity contrasts between *ez* and *az* and *this* and *that* will be ignored for the time being:[2]

a. 1. What is *that*? *That*'s an apple tree.
   2. Mi *az*? *Az* almafa.

b. 1. I like *that*.
   2. *Azt* szeretem.

c. 1. *That*'s a pretty picture.
   2. *Az* egy szép kép.

In addition to having the feature of totality in regard to reference, these deictic pronouns when unsupported by other pronominal forms do not seem to pattern with relative clauses in English (but see 7.4.3 below), while their Hungarian counterparts govern the definite conjugation when used as direct objects, as in sentence b.2 above. One aspect of the "deictic" use of the demonstratives which shows important contrasting characteristics between English and Hungarian syntactic possibilities is the fact that, once the identification of the real-world object has been made in the discourse, *this* and *that* cannot be used alone as nominals without the support of the pronoun *one*, while the Hungarian counterpart can freely occur alone, which is, in fact, true of all nominals in Hungarian. The plural forms in English, on the other hand, do follow the Hungarian pattern without a supporting nominal:

d. 1. *This* *one* is bigger than *that* *one*. (i.e., *this* *chair*, etc.)
2. *Ez* nagyobb mint *az*.

e. 1. I don't like *that* *one* at all.
2. *Ezt* egyáltalán nem szeretem.

f. 1. *These* are bigger than *those*.
2. *Ezek* nagyobbak mint *azok*.

g. 1. ? I don't like *this* at all. (i.e., *this* *chair*)
2. ? These-ones are quite large.

Strictly speaking, we have here a case of overlapping deictic and anaphoric usage, to which we may give the obvious descriptive label *deictic-anaphoric* since it is clearly a case of previous mention, while, at the same time, the real-world object is still in sight and is, in fact, usually being pointed to during the discourse. This situation is in obvious contrast on the other end of the scale with pure anaphoric usage--to be discussed more fully below--in which unsupported *this* and *that* have only linguistic referents, e.g. "*This* is what I would say if I were you ..." and "Who said *that*?"

7.3.2 Anaphoric use. The second use of the pronouns under discussion can hardly be said to be "demonstrative" in its strict sense, since in most instances the referent of the pronoun in question is not a concrete object visibly present in the real world, but is linguistic, that is, some type of noun phrase previously mentioned in the discourse. We will continue to use the term "demonstrative," however, since it is a well-established and convenient cover term for this/that and ez/az in their various uses. As was the case with other examples of previous mention, anaphoric demonstratives may be either total or partial in reference, their status of definiteness depending, as usual, on this important consideration.

7.3.2.1 Total anaphoric demonstratives. Demonstrative pronouns used anaphorically with total reference carry a measure of emphasis in contrast to the other total anaphoric pronouns discussed so far. In such usage English tends to favor that over this (sometimes with it as an alternate), while Hungarian uses az primarily and ez secondarily, both of which pattern with the definite conjugation when used as direct objects in such cases:

a. 1. John wanted to finish the job before noon, but that was impossible.
   2. János a munkát délig be akarta fejezni, de az lehetetlen volt.

b. 1. John says Steve is stupid, but I don't believe that.
   2. János azt mondja, hogy Pista ostoba, de én azt nem hiszem el.

It can be seen that the pronoun that as used in a.1 and b.1 is little more than an emphatic substitute for it, which as a total anaphoric pronoun refers to a noun phrase which may even be an entire clause. The Hungarian equivalent retains the same form az, the usual anaphoric substitute for such noun phrases which is somewhat emphatic by nature, as we have already seen in its use with restrictive clauses. However, one alternate to az which is possible in many instances of total-anaphoric usage is ez, used in particular when linguistic entities as such (or their total content) are being referred to. The usual "near-far(ther)" contrast between ez and az seems--from the English point of view--to be overridden, while the corresponding opposition in English seems to be one of (immediate) future vs. just uttered statement, i.e., "what is going to be said" = this; "what has just been said" = that. In the following examples only uses of that will be illustrated:

c. 1. That is my opinion.
   2. Ez a véleményem.

d. 1. That is what he told me.
   2. Ezt mondta nekem. (or: Ez az, amit nekem mondott.)

e. 1. What do you mean by that?
   2. Mit akar ezzel mondani?

As can be seen from the use of the definite conjugation in d.2, ez as a total anaphoric substitute is also treated as definite.

7.3.2.1.1 Emphatic agreement with speaker. The emphatic anaphoric demonstrative that is also used to indicate strong agreement with an opinion uttered by a speaker. In many cases the Hungarian equivalents have az, which actually has a much broader range of usage as a signal of assent. In each of the examples that follow it is assumed that the first utterance is spoken by one speaker, the second utterance by another:

a. 1. It was an awful place. *That* it was!
2. (Az egy) szörnyű hely volt. *Azt* meghiszem!

b. 1. They are nice fellows. *That* they are! (They are *that!*)
2. Remek fiatal emberek! *Azt* meghiszem. (Valóban *azok!*)

c. 1. Will you help me? *That* I will.
2. Segítenél nekem? *Azt* már igen!

As was hinted above, the Hungarian form *az* covers most of the range of anaphoric reference of both *it* and its stressed counterpart *that*. As a relatively unstressed form, *az* may simply be used as the affirmative answer to a yes-no question relating directly to a noun phrase. This gives somewhat greater emphasis than that achieved by the use of *igen*, which is otherwise used as a general equivalent of *yes*:

d. 1. Ki zongorázik--Feri? *Az*.
2. Who's playing the piano--Frank? *Yes*, (it's him).

or: e. 1. Feri az, aki zongorázik? *Az*..
2. Is Frank the one who's playing the piano? *Yes*, (he is).

f. 1. Mi jött be a konyhába--a kutya? *Az*.
2. What came into the kitchen--the dog? *Yes*.

or: g. 1. A kutya az, ami a konyhába jött? *Az*.
2. Was it the dog that came into the kitchen? *Yes*, (it was).

In addition to the above instances, *az* may also be the affirmative response to a question relating to a predicate adjective, which is considered a nominal in Hungarian, as in h.1 below; when, however, a predicate adjective appears together with its subject noun phrase, *az* must be supported by sentence-modifying *igen* in order to resolve the referential ambiguity, as in i.1:

h. 1. Beteg vagy? *Az* vagyok.
2. Are you sick? *Yes*, I am. (*That* I am.)

i. 1. Érdekes az a könyv? *Igen*, *az*.
2. Is that book interesting? *Yes*, *it* *is*.

It is quite apparent that anaphoric *az* as shown in the above examples and *that*, where applicable, are both total in reference as they each refer back to a previously-mentioned nominal of some sort which may range from a single form to an entire clause. They may accordingly be analyzed as definite. In the case of Hungarian, the definiteness of *az* in such instances is clearly indicated by the use of the definite conjugation whenever the demonstrative is the direct object.

7.3.2.2 *Demonstrative as partial-anaphoric pronoun.* In direct contrast to the use of the demonstratives in Hungarian as total anaphoric forms, there are instances where *az* and its English equivalents (or substitutes where necessary) are used as partitives, representing either a sub-total amount of some uncountable item or one of a given class of countable objects:

a. 1. Pista tejet kap, neked is *az* kell?[3]
   2. Steve is getting milk. Do you want *some*, too?

b. 1. Jancsinak biciklit veszek. Én is *azt* kérek.
   2. I'm buying Johnny a bicycle. *That*'s what I want, too.
   or: I want *one*, too.

As can be seen from the English pronominal equivalents, *az* used as a partitive falls into the general category of indefinite and, when used as a direct object, governs the indefinite conjugation, as seen from the form *kérek* in example b.1 above. As we have discovered in many instances previously, there is otherwise no structural difference between partial-anaphoric pronouns and indefinite pronouns, that is, those pronouns which may be used independently without prior reference or those which have no easily circumscribed noun phrase as referents. The Hungarian "demonstrative" *az* may also be used with indefinite reference, and, of course, requires the use of the indefinite conjugation when used as an object of the verb:

c. 1. *Azt* csinálok, amit akarok.[4]
   2. I do *whatever* I want.

d. 1. *Azt* gondolok, ami nekem tetszik.
   2. I think *whatever* I please.

e. 1. Szeretsz olvasni? *Azt* szeretek.
   2. Do you like to read? Yes, I do.

f. 1. *Azt* nem igérek.
   2. I'm not promising *anything* of that sort.

Examples c.1 and d.1 contain a form of *az* used as a type of anticipatory pronoun which is in direct contrast--as concerns definiteness--with the anticipatory pronouns usually associated with clause objects in Hungarian. Inasmuch as clause objects merit a full discussion of their own, any further treatment of this matter will be postponed until Chapter XII, where a more complete treatment of these types of objects and their related pronouns will be given.

7.3.3 *Demonstrative with restrictive modifiers*. The demonstrative in both English and Hungarian frequently occurs with restrictive clauses, which indicates, from what we have discovered previously, that they are often less than definite. We have already seen in various sections of this work that *az*, for example, is used in instances where its English equivalent is a partial-anaphoric pronoun in that only some of the entities included in the (previously-mentioned or situationally-understood) referent are being dealt with subsequently. Other examples were given in which the restricted demonstrative in Hungarian occurred with rather indefinite reference. (See, for example, c.1 and d.1 of 7.3.2.2 immediately above.) These examples were given without elaborating on the bilingual parallelism in patterns relating to these types of usage of these pronouns. It remains for us now to elaborate on such uses of the demonstratives in both languages in order to show once again the typical converging of the definite and indefinite categories with one and the same basic form used in partitive or independent constructions.

7.3.3.1 *Restrictive demonstratives as partitives*. The demonstrative pronouns in the plural are especially capable of collocating with restrictive modifiers to indicate partiality of reference. We previously indicated this possibility with the following example in which the Hungarian construction closely parallels the English:

a. 1. *Those* who were intelligent were interesting.
   2. *Azok*, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek voltak.

The partiality of reference in such instances may be clearly indicated by the use of the *of*-plus-noun-phrase pattern which identifies the total referent underlying the partitive pronoun:

b. 1. *Those of you* who are tired may be seated.
   2. *Kozületek azok*, akik fáradtak, leülhetnek.

While we had indicated above that deictic-anaphoric usage calls for *that one* in English, purely anaphoric partiality cannot be rendered at all, apparently, by the use of *that*, or even *that one*. The Hungarian versatile form *az*, however, can occur in the latter type of usage also:

c. 1. *Az*, aki fáradt, leülhet.
   2. *The one* who is tired may be seated.
   3. **That (one)* who is tired may be seated.

d. 1. Adja azt, amely nekem legjobban megfelel.
   2. Give me *the one* which suits me the best.
   3. *Give me *that* which suits me best. (i.e., the suit)

These forms, as we have seen in many places, pattern as indefinites when used in partial reference, even though there is an obvious relationship between such pronouns and a previously-mentioned noun phrase.

7.3.3.2 Restrictive demonstratives as independent indefinites. There is one area of usage of the restrictive demonstrative in English which may be labelled a "clear-cut" case of indefiniteness in that the pronominal form is used without a prior referent and with limiting modifier in a construction that is very closely parallel to those of forms which can occur only as indefinites. Such indefinites, which can, of course, occur independently as discourse initiators without prior referents, may often be substituted for the so-called demonstrative used in such a way, often without any change of meaning or emphasis whatever:

a. 1. There are those who feel that the war is unjust.
2. Vannak olyanak, akik úgy éreznek, hogy a háború igazságtalan.

or equally:
b. 1. There are (some) people who feel that the war is unjust.
2. Vannak (olyan) emberek, akik úgy éreznek, hogy a háború igazságtalan.

c. 1. That which was true then is true now.
2. Az, ami igaz volt akkor, most is igaz.

or:
d. 1. Whatever was true then is true now.
2. Bármi volt igaz akkor, most is igaz.

As expected, uses of restrictive that with such indefinite reference as illustrated above merge structurally--and perhaps even semantically--with partial-anaphoric usage (actually in either language) as discussed above.

7.3.3.3 *Demonstratives as possessive.* In contrast to the foregoing partially comparable uses of the demonstrative pronouns in English and Hungarian, there is a use of the English modified demonstrative which does not have a demonstrative counterpart in Hungarian. This is the total-anaphoric use of the demonstrative *that* in what amounts to possessive constructions marked by *of*-phrases. While in other types of total-anaphoric usage one would expect to find *it* employed as the replacement for a non-personal noun phrase, in the pattern type in question, *that* is regularly used instead of the unstressable *it* because of the emphatic nature of the construction--usually some type of comparison. The Hungarian equivalent usually has a pronominalizing possessive marker to indicate the deletion of the identical noun phrase:

a. 1. Ady's poetry is more abstract than *that of* Petőfi.
   2. Ady költészete elvontabb, mint Petőfi*é*.

b. 1. The foreign trade of the Soviet Union is less extensive than *that of* the United States.
   2. A Szovietunió külkereskedelme kisebb méretű, mint az Egyesült Államok*é*.

c. 1. The façade of the Cathedral of Notre Dame is more ornate than *that of* the Rheims Cathedral.
   2. A Notre Dame katedrális homlokzata díszesebb, mint a rheimsi katedrális*é*.

It is quite apparent that in at least two of the instances given above the English possessive construction with *'s* may be used as an alternate for *that of*. In fact, there seems to be a scale of probability--or acceptability--relating to the use of the inflected genitive in English as illustrated here, while, at the same time, the Hungarian consistently uses the *-é* suffix. Consequently, we may profitably label the English *'s* construction "preferable" in a.1 (*Petőfi's*), "possible" in b.1 (*the Soviet Union's* or *the USSR's*, but perhaps not *the Union of Soviet Socialist*

Republics'), and "impossible" in c.1 (*_the Rheims Cathedral_'_s_). There are many more ramifications to the determination of the status of definiteness of various types of possessive constructions and the substitutes for them. However, suffice it to say at this point that the particular types discussed here are "definite" in both English and Hungarian because of their total-anaphoric nature. It is quite evident that these anaphoric forms represent all except the possessive of the previously-mentioned (identical) noun phrases they replace in the second part of their respective sentences. We shall defer until Chapter XI any extended discussion of possessive constructions in general.

7.3.4 _Miscellaneous uses of the demonstrative forms._ In addition to the above cases of demonstrative use in English and Hungarian, there are other fairly common occurrences in which the pronoun in question functions in a way that is best described as idiomatic. No attempt can be made here to analyze all possible constructions of this catch-all category. However, several of them are worth mentioning for comparative purposes, if for no other reason.

7.3.4.1 _Demonstrative as derogatory personal pronoun._ In both languages being analyzed here the demonstrative--that is, the low- (or back-) vowel variety, which seems to be the preferred form when there is point-of-view contrast intended--is used with derogatory effect in the place of the usual definite anaphoric personal pronoun. This usage cannot be called deictic inasmuch as the individual being referred to need not be in sight but only properly identified for both speaker and hearer:

a. 1. Did you really have a date with *that*?
2. Igazán volt talalkád *az*zal?

The form *that* in a.1 above meets the same test for definiteness as the more usual pronoun *it* in that it refers to all of the previously-mentioned noun phrase underlying it in prior discourse. We might say that *that* here is definitely definite, and the same holds for its Hungarian equivalent in a.2.

7.3.4.2 *Other occurrences of English demonstratives.* There are other combinations in English in which the form *that* occurs as a constituent. These are best left unanalyzed and need not concern us here greatly. It may be of interest, however, to show that these combinations may occur as various parts of speech, including "indefinite pronouns." The following examples may be noted together with a possible Hungarian equivalent: *all that* (everything of that sort) = *ilyesmi*, (to such a degree) = *annyira*, *for all that* = *mégis*, *at that* = *ráadásul*, and the like. Here again the status of definiteness of these forms is in doubt because of the lack of a specifiable referent and the difficulty of applying any structural test to these forms in their set environments.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. It goes without saying that practically any grammatical rule such as the one just formulated may be violated for various reasons, one of which is comic effect. For example, a cartoon caption in Punch capitalizes on the surprise effect achieved by the use of non-reflexive forms in the place of the expected reflexives: "We have an ideal marriage--I love me and he loves him." (Reproduced in the "Telegraphic Section" of the Painesville (O.) Telegraph, Nov. 2, 1968, p.6.)

2. It should be briefly noted here that whenever identification is requested with the use of a demonstrative pronoun in English, the answer may contain the form it instead of the demonstrative: "It's an apple tree." This is, of course, only one aspect of the total range of the anaphoric pronoun it.

3. Examples a.1 and b.1 are taken from the Értelmező Szótár I, p. 368b.

4. Examples c.1, d.1, and e.1 are taken from Bánhidi-Jókay (1960:408); f.1 and f.2 are from Hall (1944:77).

CHAPTER VIII

THE -IK PRONOUNS AND THEIR ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS

8.0 Introduction

The Hungarian pronouns in -ik are invariably included in the traditional list of the object types which require the use of the definite conjugation as given in grammars of Hungarian, e.g. Tompa (1962:159). The definite status of these pronouns is sometimes explained diachronically, for example: "The ending -ik is philologically identical with the -uk, -ük possessive suffix of the 3rd. Person Plural ... The pronouns ending in -ik, since this ending has been a possessive suffix, require the definite conjugation." (Bánhidi et al. 1965:158). There are, however, at least two synchronic considerations militating against accepting this analysis as descriptively adequate, namely, 1) these pronouns themselves may now occur with possessive suffixes in the same fashion as nouns, and 2) being provided with possessive suffixes is not in itself a sufficient condition for definite status for a noun phrase, as will be shown in Chapter V. The obvious syntactic characteristic of the -ik pronouns pertinent for us here is their almost exclusive anaphoric nature. They may be analyzed as definite on the basis of previous mention (or, of course, situational identification) plus the feature of totality. If these criteria are lacking, even an -ik pronoun may be indefinite. Compare, for example, (egy) másik 'another' with a másik 'the other (one).' Since the referents underlying the -ik pronouns are clearly circumscribed in prior discourse, the definiteness of such pronouns may even override the effect of an otherwise indefinitizing prefix such as akár-:

a. 1. Akármelyiket elfogadta volna. (Tompa 1962:159)
   2. He would have accepted any one of them.

which could be a natural response to a question such as:

b. 1. Melyiket kivánja?[1]
   2. Which one does he want?

It ought to be mentioned here that, even without the reinforcing pronoun *one*, the English equivalent *which* (with *of them* always deleted) is considered by at least two other linguists to be a definite form on the basis of the strongly anaphoric nature of the pronoun.[2] There are cases, however, where the all-pervasive definiteness of the Hungarian -*ik* pronouns is not indicated in the most acceptable English equivalent. Consider the invariable definiteness of *egyik* (as opposed to *másik*), for example, which holds even in those negative sentences where logically all of the definite set of entities referred to are excluded as a discourse referent:

c. 1. Egyiket sem kivánom. (also: *semelyiket* ...)
   2. I want none (of them). (Lit., 'Not even one do I want.')

The most frequent employment of the -*ik* pronouns, however, does occur with the definite article as the marker of their definite nature, as in the following generic statement:

d. 1. Az egyik baj eltemeti a másikat.
   2. One misfortune buries the other (next).

The overwhelmingly definite-anaphoric nature of the -*ik* pronominals is also indicated in the use of the definite articles with ordinal numbers and also by the fact that this suffix may be added optionally to adjectives in the comparative or superlative (the latter--as in English--generally occurring with the definite article in any case), if these forms are used anaphorically. We shall examine these two patterns separately.

8.1 Ordinal pronominals

Both languages agree in the status of definiteness of ordinals used pronominally since, by convention, such pronominalizations generally occur only after previous mention (or, as usual, situational identification) allows the unambiguous deletion of the noun being delimited by the ordinal. After previous mention a discourse may be continued, for example, by a sentence as the following:

a. 1. *A hatodik* a legjobb.
   2. *The sixth one* is the best.

The same theoretical and philosophic problems which we have encountered previously with regard to discourse referents and the like for any definite noun phrase also hold for the notion of "previous mention" relating to -*ik* nominals of the sort mentioned immediately above, since the identifying context does not necessarily have to precede the definitized noun phrase. The following example, for instance, illustrates a case where previous mention and situational identification merge inasmuch as the identifying situation is linguistically supplied:

b. 1. Én voltam a sorban az ötödik.
   2. I was the fifth in line.

Ordinals are also used in stating dates in either language, but there is a contrast in form in that the Hungarian ordinal always appears marked with a possessive suffix, while the English equivalent may occur with the *of*-phrase deleted:

c. 1. Hatodikán utazott el.
   2. He left on the sixth.

d. 1. f. hó hatodikán
   2. on the sixth of this month

The possessive pattern is also employed in Hungarian when requesting the date, while the equivalent genitive phrase in English is usually deleted:

e. 1. Hányadika van ma?
   2. What day is today? (or: What day of the month is it today?)

8.2 Comparatives and superlatives in -ik

As mentioned above, anaphoric comparative and superlative adjectives pattern with the definite article in Hungarian, and both may occur optionally with the pronominalizing suffix -ik. The English equivalents, on the other hand, generally require the use of the pronominalizer one:

a. 1. A kisebb(ik) is jó lesz.[3]
   2. The smaller one will be all right too.

b. 1. A nagyobb(ik)ra rá se nézett.
   2. He didn't even look at the larger one.

c. 1. A legszebb(ik)et választotta.
   2. She chose the prettiest one.

This pattern may be compared to that in which the comparative is employed as a predicate in an equational (i.e., identifying) sentence. Here the article is optional in Hungarian with -ik excluded, while the English equivalent has either an unsupported adjective form, or a pronominalized one with both the definite article and one:

d. 1. Azt gondolom, hogy ez (a) szebb.
   2. I believe this is (the) prettier (one).

As a final remark it might be stated that in both languages the notion of dual choice is strongly present in the use of the comparative, and this may be overtly indicated by the inclusion of the exact dual referent underlying the pronominalized form:

e. 1. A kettő közül melyik (a) különb?
   2. Of the two which one is the better?
      (or: ... which is the better one?)

There is no doubt, of course, that in both languages one can find that the strict number relationship traditionally associated with the comparative is not always adhered to. One does find the superlative employed in place of the expected comparative, but whichever is used, they both seem to behave the same in regard to their place in the definite category.

8.3 Possessive quantitative pronouns in Hungarian

The last type of Hungarian pronoun which we will discuss as being definite belongs to a mixed category, both morphologically and syntactically. These pronouns are, first of all, quantity pronominals appended with possessive suffixes, for example, *kettejük* 'the two of them' (cf. *kettő* 'two'), *hármónk* '(the) three of us' (cf. *három* 'three'), *többünk* 'several of us' (cf. *több* 'more/several'), etc. Now some of these forms are quite rare and all are of limited syntactic range. However, there is an interesting feature of at least one of these pronouns which is worth including in a discussion on the category of definiteness in Hungarian. This feature is their ambivalence, which manifests itself in two ways. First of all, some of these possessive numerical pronouns, according to one analysis (Bánhidi and Jókay 1960:406) display the same characteristics of definiteness, when used as objects, as all of the other "definite" noun phrase types discussed in this work. That is, as indefinite partitives they pattern with the indefinite conjugation; otherwise they are definite. Observe the following contrastive examples:

a. 1. Hármónkat kiválasztott. (also: *hármunkat*)
   2. He chose three of us.

b. 1. Kiválasztot*ta* hármónkat.
   2. He chose the three of us.

Secondly, another series of pronouns of this type is exceptional in that it seems to vary in structural definiteness with a change in the person of the *subject* just as much as with a change in person of the *object*, as otherwise may be the case with object pronouns. The pronouns in question are plural possessives built on the base *mind* 'all' and occur only in non-subject functions: *mindnyájunkat* 'all of us (acc.),' *mindnyájatokat* 'all of you (pl. acc.),' and *mindnyájukat* 'all of them (acc.).'[4] While the third person form *mindnyájukat* patterns, as expected, with the definite conjugation, the other two pronouns under discussion pattern varyingly, depending on the person of the subject. If the subject is the first person, then the first person object pronoun patterns with the definite; if the subject is the second person, then the second person object pronoun takes the definite conjugation; if, however, the subject is in the third person, then either conjugation is possible:

	c. 1.	Látom mindnyájunkat.	I see all of us.
	2.	Látjátok mindnyájatokat.	You see all of you(rselves).
	d. 1.	Lát mindnyájunkat.	He sees all of us.
but also:	2.	Látja mindnyájunkat.	He sees all of us.
	e. 1.	Hív mindnyájatokat.	He's calling all of you.
but also:	2.	Hívja mindnyájatokat.	He's calling all of you.

In those instances where the first or second person is the subject, c.1 and c.2 above, one may call the object pronouns a type of reflexive, which, as we have seen, is always considered a definite object in Hungarian. In the case of the third person subject, on the other hand, the variation in conjugational selection seems to be unmotivated since the Hungarian informant consulted could determine no difference in meaning between the two patterns as employed here.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. Example b.1 is adapted from, and c.1 is quoted from Bánhidi et al. (1965:150).

2. See, for example, Lees and Klima (1963) and the references given there.

3. The Hungarian examples used in this section are taken from the *Értelmező szótár* I:5.

4. The examples and the analysis here are from Tompa (1962: 159).

CHAPTER IX

INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

9.0 Introduction

"Indefinite" pronouns have been discussed quite extensively but secondarily, in many of the sections of previous chapters. Here will be brought together the most essential points of what, for comparative purposes, has been previously said in regard to the broad spectrum of indefiniteness as it applies to pronouns. Then this chapter will conclude with a discussion of an important category of pronominal (and structurally ambivalent) forms, namely, the substantival interrogatives and the relative pronouns derived from them.

9.1 Independent indefinite pronouns

There are indefinite pronouns in both English and Hungarian which may be used without prior reference in the discourse, that is, without any previously-mentioned or implied noun phrase referents underlying them, and which may therefore be called "independent indefinite pronouns."[1] These pronouns, in obvious contrast to anaphoric pronouns, may be used to initiate a discourse, needing no particular referent to "replace" or "stand for." As indicated previously, some of these pronouns are overtly marked for indefiniteness by formative elements such as _some_- and _vala_- in, for example, _somebody_, _something_, etc., _valaki_, _valami_, etc., or by -_ever_, which has two possible equivalents, _akár_- and _bár_-, as in _whatever_, _whoever_, etc., _akármi_ and _akárki_ (or _bármi_ and _bárki_), etc. In addition to these morphological parallelisms, one finds that these pronouns consistently pattern as indefinites in either language. The English pronouns, for example, seem to be incompatible with non-restrictive clauses:

a. 1. Everyone (whom) I know hates him.
but not: 2. *Everyone, whom I know, hates him.

b. 1. Somebody (who was) wearing a mask robbed the bank.
but not: 2. *Somebody, who was wearing a mask, robbed the bank.

The equivalent pronouns in Hungarian are similarly indefinite and collocate with the indefinite conjugation when used as objects:

c. 1. Mindenkit üdvözlött. (indef.)
2. He greeted everyone.

d. 1. Keresel valakit? (indef.)
2. Are you looking for someone?

e. 1. Ők mindent tudnak. (indef.)
2. They know everything.

9.1.1 *Independent indefiniteness vs. totality*. We have frequently encountered the phenomenon in both languages being studied here that partiality of reference almost always overrides any other criterion for definiteness throughout the whole syntactic category. We have concluded that *syntactic* totality must be a concurrent feature of a nominal in addition to other criteria before full definiteness can be achieved. Now we can observe that there is a corollary to this phenomenon, namely, that *semantic* totality as such is not a sufficient condition to assure definitization, for, although such pronouns as *everyone/ everybody*, *everything*, Hungarian: *mindenki*, *minden* are semantically all-inclusive, they nonetheless pattern syntactically like any other indefinite pronoun. Here the complete lack of referent militates against definitization, that is to say, the totality involved here is not one of identity to any previously-mentioned or identified noun phrase. This fact can be used as a criterion for separating the independent indefinites from the partitive pronouns, both of which are generally lumped together under the traditional label "indefinite pronouns."

9.1.2 Independent indefinites vs. partitives. Although, as previously mentioned, there is very little intra-sentential structural difference between independent indefinite pronouns and partitives, there certainly is enough inter-sentential significance in this categorization to warrant a few remarks concerning it in a contrastive analysis such as the present work. In the first place, the independent indefinite vs. partitive distinction must be noted in English to account for the obvious fact that many sentences are "complete" in themselves as discourse initiators while others require previous mention or other identification for full comprehension. In Hungarian, on the other hand, this same distinction accounts for the fact that the indefinite conjugation may be used alone--that is, with the object deleted--to indicate partitiveness, while independent indefiniteness must be indicated by the use of an appropriate indefinite pronoun. Compare the use of the indefinite in a.1 with the use of a partitive in b.1:

a. 1. Akarsz valamit?
   2. Do you want something?

b. 1. Akarsz belőle?
   2. Do you want (some) of it?

The consequences of this particular dichotomy, however, are not as striking as the definite vs. partitive contrast, in which partiality moves otherwise definite noun phrases into the structurally indefinite category.

9.2 Interrogative and relative pronouns

Leaving aside all polemics concerning the best theoretical method of deriving the relative pronouns in English from interrogative pronouns,[2] we consider it obvious that these two pronoun types have some sort of relationship to each other--morphological, if no other--and may be profitably discussed together. The same can be said for the corresponding forms in Hungarian, the relative pronouns of which seem to be a composite of the definite article a + the interrogative pronoun:

interrogative		relative	
ki?	who?	aki (amely)	who, that
mi?	what?	ami (amely)	which, what, that
melyik?	which (one)?	amelyik	which, that

Since we are primarily concerned here with the status of interrogatives and relatives in the category of definiteness, which is a feature of noun phrases, we will use the substantive forms given above as the basis for our discussion. We will accordingly exclude adverbial interrogatives of all sorts such as where?, when?, how?, etc., and their Hungarian equivalents, as important as they might be in a fuller discussion of pronominal forms. For our purposes here these adverbial interrogatives, as well as all possible adjectival or other non-substantival interrogative forms have less direct connection with the category of definiteness.

9.2.1 Independent interrogatives. The three substantival interrogatives listed above must in turn be divided into two groups: "independent" (or "general") interrogatives, who? and what? (ki? and mi?), and the "anaphoric interrogative" which? (melyik?). The latter pronouns, as we have seen, may be classified as characteristically definite because of their deictic-anaphoric nature. The other two interrogatives, who? (ki?) and what? (mi?), on the other hand, may be categorized as indefinite since they independently request the very type of information necessary for definitization. The definiteness of the English forms is otherwise difficult to test structurally because of their limited syntactic range. As interrogatives these forms can co-occur with, for example, relative clauses only in a very limited way, thereby separating themselves from independent indefinite pronouns on the one hand, and "personal pronouns" in more formal styles on the other. This is to say that while we may have, for example, *something which* ... and *you, who* ... or even, *he who* ..., we cannot readily have **what*? *which*.... or **who*? *who* ... However, some dialects accept *who*? *that* ... and *what*? *that* ..., which are acceptable to me only if discontinuous: "Who was there that we know?" or "What do you want that you don't have?" These clauses, of course, are restrictive. The equivalent interrogative pronouns in Hungarian, on the other hand, show the usual patterning with the indefinite conjugation when used as objects, in addition to their inability to collocate with relative clauses:

a. 1. Mit látsz?
   2. What do you see?

b. 1. Kit látsz?
   2. Who(m) do you see?

As we have seen, the indefiniteness of these pronouns in Hungarian is in direct contrast to the permanent definiteness of *melyik*?:

c. 1. Melyiket látod?
   2. Which (one) do you see?

since the latter form obviously refers to one entity out of a previously-mentioned group. The same holds true for the possessive form *whose*?, which may be pronominalized, that is, the noun associated with it may be deleted, after previous mention has established the identity of its referent. The Hungarian equivalent has a special pronominalizing possessive suffix which unambiguously marks the noun as definite. In fact, *which* and *whose* as pronouns may be interchangeable in some contexts since they both refer to items singled out from a previously-mentioned group. The Hungarian equivalents behave in the same manner. In both cases it is apparent that we are dealing with definites, as can be tested structurally: inability to pattern with relative clauses in the case of the English forms, and government of the definite conjugation in the case of the Hungarian. We may juxtapose these two definite pronouns in one sample sentence for each language:

d. 1. Which/Whose did you find? (i.e., *book*)
   2. Melyiket/Kiét találtad meg?

9.2.2 *Interrogative-relative pronouns*. Intermediate between the two categories of usage, interrogative pronoun and relative pronoun, is the syntactic category which may conveniently be labelled "interrogative-relative." This is the occurrence of the original interrogative in indirect speech, in which case the pronoun retains its interrogative function while also serving to introduce the object clause. This distinction has considerable structural significance, including the fact that a change in word order is involved in English, while the clause-introducing function of the equivalent in Hungarian may be taken over by the subordinating conjunction *hogy*, the object clause otherwise retaining the original interrogative word order. In the following examples the sentences marked 2. are to be taken as responses to the respective questions preceding them:

	a. 1.	What is that?	Mi az?
	2.	I don't know what that is.	Nem tudom, (hogy) mi az.
	b. 1.	Who is that man (there)?	Ki az a férfi (ott)?
	2.	I don't know who that man is.	Nem tudom, (hogy) ki az a férfi.
but:	c. 1.	Who's sitting there now?	Ki ül most ott?
	2.	I don't know who's sitting there now.	Nem tudom, (hogy) ki ül most ott.
	d. 1.	Who did he see there?	Kit látott ott?
	2.	I don't know who he saw there.	Nem tudom, (hogy) kit látott ott.

Except for the difference in word order, e.g., in a.2 and b.2, as opposed to that in c.2 and d.2, the fundamental syntactic properties of the English interrogatives within these dependent clauses do not seem to be significantly different from their properties as pure indefinite interrogatives. We shall accordingly interpret the former pronouns as indefinite also, although, admittedly, other structural tests are impossible to make here. In the Hungarian equivalent of d.2, on the other hand, the verb in the object clause clearly marks the relative pronoun as indefinite. The contrasting use of the definite conjugation with the main verb in the same sentence, however, entails a discussion which will be postponed until Chapter XII, where the status of the whole (dependent) noun clause itself within the category of definiteness will be discussed at length.

9.2.3 Relative pronouns. Establishing the place of the English and Hungarian relative pronouns within the category of definiteness poses an interesting problem, both from the monolingual, as well as from the contrastive point of view. The pronouns we will be primarily dealing with here are who and its objective form *who(m)*, zero, and *that/which*, and their Hungarian equivalents. We shall start this phase of our discussion with a treatment of the pronouns of personal reference.

9.2.3.1 *Personal reference with relative pronouns.* In dealing with relative pronouns in English, we must proceed from the fact we have already established, namely, that they may introduce either restrictive or non-restrictive clauses. As we have already indicated, junctural phenomena keep these two clause types apart in speech, while commas are traditionally used to set off non-restrictive ("appositive") clauses in writing. In our examples here we will continue to follow this practice.

9.2.3.1.1 *Relative pronouns in non-restrictive clauses.* We have shown above that a non-restrictive clause modifying a noun phrase in English indicates that this noun phrase is definite and total, that is, it is already identified without the information given in the relative clause. It remains for us here to test whether the pronoun which joins a non-restrictive clause to such a noun phrase is also definite. We may begin here by reviewing two observations we have made in regard to definite noun phrases: 1) A singular definite noun phrase relating totally or identically to a non-collective antecedent is generally followed by a non-restrictive clause only (or, of course, by a repetitive restrictive one) and 2) A noun phrase which has a plural or collective referent in prior discourse is followed by a non-restrictive clause if the relative clause applies to *all* of the entities underlying the antecedent. These statements may be illustrated as follows:

a. 1. I saw a man slip on the sidewalk this morning.
(all) 2. The man, who was around 60, was slightly hurt.

b. 1. I saw a group of men enter the school.
(all) 2. The men, who were quite young, were foreign visitors.

Sentences a.2 and b.2 both reflect properly the totality of reference, and with this fact in mind, we can assert that who in the relative clause of sentence a.2 is a likely replacement for a deleted noun phrase, the man: "The man (previously mentioned)--the man was around 60--was slightly hurt." In a similar fashion the clause "who were quite young" in b.2 represents a reduced sentence, "The men were (all) quite young." Accordingly, we may classify the relative pronouns in a.2 and b.2 as "total definite." This is in contrast to the relatives in restrictive clauses, which we have judged to be unacceptable to convey the idea of totality of reference to a previously-identified antecedent. We note, for example, that that does not seem to be an acceptable replacement in standard English for who in a non-restrictive clause as those above:

c. 1. *The man, that was around 60, was slightly hurt.
2. *The men, that were quite young, were foreign visitors.

In a subtotal sense, of course, the latter sentences would be acceptable if the clauses they contain were changed into restrictive ones. These cases will be discussed separately.

9.2.3.1.2 Relatives in restrictive clauses. If we modify sentence a.1 above, we can provide a suitable discourse in which a following restrictive clause is perfectly acceptable, and, if we are not referring to the whole group of men mentioned in b.1, then b.2 below is similarly acceptable:

a. 1. I saw two men slip on the sidewalk.
   2. The man who/that was around 60 was slightly hurt.

b. 1. I saw a group of men enter the school.
   2. The men who/that were quite young were foreign visitors.

We note that that is substitutable here for who in the restrictive clauses, and if we now examine the status of the relative pronouns in these two sentences with partitive meaning, we can see that the underlying forms are partitives, but are still definite: "One man (of a previously-mentioned group)--the man was around 60--was hurt." = "The man who was around 60 was slightly hurt." The underlying forms of the two sentences combined to form b.2 may be given as follows: "Some men (of a previously-mentioned group)--these men were quite young--were foreign visitors," which reduces to: "The men who were quite young were foreign visitors." Although the man of a.2 and the men of b.2 may be labelled "partial definite" because of the concurrent occurrence of the definite article and the restrictive relative clause with the nouns, it would be difficult to go beyond the dichotomy of definite vs. indefinite in the case of the relative pronouns, inasmuch as further structural tests fail to make a finer distinction. The relative pronouns here--as partitives--might be simply labelled "partial-definite" by analogy to the noun phrases which underlie them. However, when we go beyond the mere relative pronoun and consider the entire noun phrase of a complex sentence such as a.2 and b.2 above, that is, when determiner plus noun plus the relative clause are considered together, much more can be said with regard to degrees of definiteness. The following section will treat of this matter, and we will attempt to draw conclusions from these patterns which will be valid for the whole category of definiteness in both languages.

9.2.3.1.3 Hungarian personal relatives vs. determiner patterns. In order to discuss Hungarian relative pronouns in the most meaningful way, one must recall what has been already mentioned in regard to these pronouns and the types of clause they can occur in, namely that Hungarian grammar does not make a clear distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses. Neither juncture nor orthography consistently distinguishes the two clause types. Accordingly, the task of distinguishing the status of definiteness of a noun phrase in Hungarian rests not with the relative clause or its introductory pronoun, but primarily with the various determiners of the given noun phrases. This was already shown, for example, in the discussion of total vs. partial reference where two different definite determiners in Hungarian carried the contrast while the relative clauses remained the same:

a. 1. A férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, ...
   2. The men, who were intelligent, ...

vs. b. 1. Azok a férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, ...
   2. The men who were intelligent ...

Since the relative clause patterns do not contrast here, one can assume that the status of definiteness of the relative pronouns would be the same also. This proves to be the case. However, while the Hungarian subject noun phrases in a.1 and b.1 are considered definite, the relative pronouns pattern as indefinites--as do almost all relative pronouns in Hungarian, regardless of the status of the nouns they relate to. Let us now focus our attention on this aspect of the grammar of Hungarian.

9.2.3.1.4 Status of definiteness of Hungarian relative pronouns. Although for the purpose of easier explication, from the point of view of English grammar, we are purposely discussing only relative pronouns of "personal reference" at this point in our study, there is in a stricter sense little motivation for separating personal from non-personal relative pronoun types in Hungarian since there is a great deal of overlapping to be observed. Furthermore, what is said in regard to the definiteness of one of these types of relative pronouns holds for the other also. Variation in definiteness of Hungarian relative pronouns occurs only in the area of "overlap," that is, with the employment of the definite form melyik, which may have either a personal or non-personal referent. The generally-used relative pronoun of personal reference, aki, on the other hand, not only shows a uniformity of form and patterning, regardless of the definite status of the noun phrase it relates to, but also governs the use of the indefinite conjugation when used as an object in its clause, again regardless of the status of its antecedent. Several sample sentences showing this characteristic should suffice for the present:

a. 1. A tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, rövidesen nyugdíjba megy.
   2. The teacher, whom everyone likes, is to retire soon.

b. 1. Az a tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, rövidesen nyugdíjba megy.
   2. The teacher whom everyone likes is going to retire soon.

c. 1. Egy tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, rövidesen nyugdíjba megy.
   2. A teacher whom everyone likes is going to retire soon.

d. 1. Egy olyan tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, egy igazi kincs.
   2. A teacher whom everyone likes is a real treasure.

The indefiniteness of *aki* may be accounted for by the fact that there is such a close synchronic connection between this relative pronoun and the indefinite interrogative pronoun *ki* that it is difficult to draw a precise boundary between them. In the first place, the relative pronoun of personal reference (along with the other relatives) may occur without the prefix *a-* in some styles of speech and writing:

e. 1. János, (a)kit mindenki kedvel, adta ide nekem.
2. John, who(m) everyone likes, gave it to me.

In the second place, *aki* may be used as an independent "relative" pronoun without any particular noun phrase to which it can be related, in which case the modern English equivalent generally has the indefinite suffix -*ever*, or is composed of some other combination of pronoun plus indefinite marker:

f. 1. *Akit* szeretett, elhagyta, *akit* gyűlölt, jót tett vele.[3]
2. *Who*(*m*)(*ever*) he loved, he left; *who*(*m*)(*ever*) he hated, he was good to.

g. 1. Van, *aki* szereti a sárgarépát.
2. There are *those who* like carrots. (lit.: "is *someone who*")

h. 1. *Akik* elmúltak 10 évesek, álljanak ide.
2. *Those* who are over 10 years old should line up here.

i. 1. Nincs, aki megmondja neki az igazat.
2. There is *no one who* dares tell him the truth.

In proverbs and other older styles of English *who* may also occur as an independent relative, giving a pattern closely parallel to the Hungarian, e.g., "*Who* steals my purse steals trash ..." In any case, the status of indefiniteness of the underlined forms is, I believe, quite apparent in all of the examples. It might be noted that in addition to the marked indefiniteness of *akit* in f.1, the examples given in h.1 and i.1 show another common pattern in which indefinites often occur. This is the pattern in which van "there is" (or its negative nincs) is used to state (or deny) the existence of an entity as yet unspecified. In addition to the fact that aki is indefinite within its own clause, the relative clause itself thereby seems to be indefinite here. This is in contrast to the usual definiteness of noun clauses--in either language--especially those derived from direct questions, which are most often treated as definites, as we shall see in Chapter XII.

9.2.3.1.5 The definite relative amelyik. The relative pronoun amelyik deserves special treatment here for several reasons. First of all, it is the only relative pronoun in Hungarian which as a direct object patterns with the definite conjugation. In the second place, it can occur with either personal or non-personal reference. Finally, it shows a consistency in usage not matched in any one counterpart in English. Now we have previously seen that the interrogative counterpart of amelyik, melyik, and its English equivalent which are the only interrogative pronouns in the languages being studied here which are considered to be as definite as the possessive pronouns kié and whose. These interrogatives show, accordingly, many close structural parallelisms. The relative pronouns amelyik and which, on the other hand, show many fewer structural correspondances, mainly because of the divergent patterns of the English forms, which need to be displayed in a contrastive work such as this. While the interrogative melyik and its English counterpart which request a selection from a previously-identified group of entities, only the relative amelyik consistently continues to have this function, with either personal or non-personal reference. The relative *which*, on the other hand, is used primarily in reference to non-personal antecedents, either definite concrete objects--not necessarily from a previously-mentioned group--or ideas contained in statements of various kinds just given by the speaker. Several examples will be given in which *amelyik* performs its usual function, here with personal reference. From the English translations it can be seen that *which* is rarely employed with personal reference:

a. 1. Hívd meg, *amelyiket* akarod.
    2. Invite *the one* you want. (or *whichever one* you prefer)
b. 1. Három fia volt, s azt szerette legjobban, *amelyik* leginkább hasonlított hozzá. (also *aki*)
    2. He had three sons, and he loved best of all *the one who/that* resembled him the most.

The cases where unsupported *which* does have a personal reference seem to be those in which the pronoun is in an indirect question and appears only as an interrogative-relative or non-relative pronoun. For example:

c. 1. He has two songs, Joe and Pete, but I don't know *which* is *which*.
    2. Két fia van, Jóska és Pista, de én nem tudom *melyikük melyik*. '*which of them*'

Here it can be assumed that *which* is definite for the same reasons we gave for the definiteness of the corresponding direct use of the interrogative. *Amelyik*, on the other hand, always requires the use of the definite conjugation and is best rendered into English as *the one who/that* to convey the idea of definiteness. The use of *that*, incidentally, for personal as well as non-personal reference shows a close parallelism with the pronoun *amelyik* in at least one regard, but, of course, this fact has little bearing on the definite status of the English forms.

Another well-known sidelight to the issue of overlapping reference of person is the fact that the relative pronouns in English may be deleted when they occur as the objects in their clauses. Relative pronoun deletion in Hungarian does not seem to occur at any level of usage, regardless of reference, definiteness, or function within the clause.

9.2.3.2 *Concrete non-personal reference with relative pronouns.* It was indicated above that the range of reference of *amelyik* extends over both personal and non-personal antecedents in Hungarian, while *that* serves a similar function in English. In addition to these two pronouns, the languages being studied here each have a relative pronoun generally used in non-personal reference, namely *amely* and *which*. From the examples below it can be seen that, unlike *amelyik*, the pronoun *amely* as object patterns with the indefinite conjugation, regardless of the status of definiteness of its antecedent:[4]

a. 1. Ez az a ló, *amelyet* apám vett.
   2. This is the horse (*which*/*that*) my father bought.

b. 1. Vettem egy könyvet, *melyet* jutalmul a fiamnak adok.
   2. I bought a book *which* I'm going to give to my son as a prize. (or *that*)

c. 1. Az olyan sereg, *amelyet* vezére elhagy, felbomlik.
   2. An army *which*/*that* its commander abandons disintegrates. (or *which* is abandoned by its commander)

In regard to the choice of the non-personal relative pronouns in the English sentences above, the native informants questioned were evenly divided in their preference for *that* in the place of *which*. As for the status of definiteness of these forms, there seems to be little motivation for considering either one more definite than the other in such sentences as those above where the pronouns are interchangeable. Once the definite status of one alternate has been ascertained, the status of the other should be considered the same. I would classify the relative pronouns in these three English sentences primarily on the basis of the underlying form of the sentence from which the relative clause had been derived. Thus, the relative pronouns in b.2 and c.2, for example, differ from each other since it is apparent that in b.2 a definite noun phrase, the book (as previously mentioned or identified in the first part of the complex sentence) or it, underlies the relative pronoun, while an introductory indefinite, an army, underlies the relative in c.2. In the first instance, the object is identified, after which additional information is given in regard to the now-identified object. In c.2, on the other hand, the relative clause is the identifying context necessary for definitization so that, while the subject of the main clause may be considered generic and therefore definite in some sense or other, the relative pronoun in such sentences lacks--for the moment--the conditions necessary for definitization and should therefore be considered indefinite. It is possible, of course, that an English sentence such as a.2 above is a direct answer to a question referring to a choice from among a definite group, in which case, the relative pronoun could be considered definite through previous identification, for example:

d. 1. Which horse did your father buy?
   2. This is the horse which my father bought.

Again, however, if a.2 were considered as containing the introductory sentence itself embedded within it, then the relative pronoun might be considered indefinite.

9.3 Summary of the status of pronouns in the category of definiteness

After such a long survey of the general usage of pronouns in English and Hungarian and their status within the category of definiteness, it may prove useful to summarize the main points brought out in the various discussions. It was shown that the rules for definitization of noun phrases in their basic forms also apply to the definitization of pronouns as well. Previous mention was seen to be the principal basis for considering an entity definite, provided, of course, the reference to the previously-mentioned noun is total. Therefore a pronoun such as he is as definite as the man in subsequent discourse after a suitable referent has been established. There are, in addition to the "total-definite" pronouns, which result from the above-mentioned situation, forms which may be labelled "partial-definite" since they refer to only part of the entities included in a previously-mentioned group. Lastly, one can recognize at least two levels of "indefiniteness" in pronouns also. One level, "independent indefinite," is represented by such forms as someone, something, who?, what?, etc., which require no previous mention for its employment. The other type of "indefinite" is more properly called "partitive" or "partial-anaphoric," possible only after some referent has been established in prior discourse. The notion of previous mention (or situational identification, of course), in conjunction with the feature of totality, remains the keystone of definiteness in both languages, not only in the case of the pronouns, but also in the case of virtually all noun phrase types, such as possessives, proper nouns, and noun clauses, all of which will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. In transformational-generative terms one would (at present) say that the pronouns under discussion here are "generated in the base" rather than "derived transformationally."

2. See, for example, Koutsoudas (1968a) and the references given there.

3. The following four Hungarian sentences are taken from the Értelmező Szótár I, p. 84.

4. Sentences a.1 and c.1 are from the Értelmező Szótár I, p. 196, b.1 from Tompa (1962:330).

5. Or, in transformational terms, an "intermediate" (i.e. "non-existent") nominalization of the verb phrase (VP) in the preceding part of the sentence. This analysis has much that is useful in it and will, accordingly, be given as an alternate suggestion below.

6. It may be of interest to note that Webster's Third New International Dictionary (p. 2603c) indicates that some grammarians object to the use of which in such cases, while its Hungarian counterpart, ami, is labelled (irod. sajtó) 'literary' and 'journalistic' in the Értelmező Szótár I (p. 199b). The non-literary example given for the latter form was accompanied by a suggested correct form.

CHAPTER X

PROPER NOUNS

10.0 Introduction

In the Introduction to this study we cited passages from four different sources in which it was stated that proper nouns are to be classified as definite. The authors of these statements, one of which pertains to Hungarian and three to English, give no further elaboration nor attempt to qualify or modify their statements in any way, thus leaving a great deal of data pertaining to proper nouns unaccounted for. It is an open question whether one can speak of proper nouns as being definite *per se*, or whether one must look for various criteria being met before any classification can be made in regard to the definiteness of various occurrences of such nouns. This chapter, then, will test the notion of definiteness of proper nouns by examining all types of occurrences of such forms as they are traditionally thought of. It is hoped that definitive statements can be formulated in regard to the status of proper nouns in the category of definiteness.

As a working definition we shall use the definition of proper noun (or "proper name") given in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing, does not take a limiting modifier, and is usu. capitalized in English." (page 1818a). An improvement on this definition will be suggested at the end of this chapter.

10.1 Determiners with "proper nouns"

In Chapter I of this study we discussed the use of the definite article to mark a common noun in both English and Hungarian that has been definitized through previous mention or is considered definite through mutual knowledge or assumed identification by speaker and hearer in the situation in which discourse is taking place. In the light of the above definition of proper nouns, on the other hand, use of the definite article, or any other overt article, for that matter, would presumably have the effect of reducing the proper noun to common, if one assumes the definition quoted above is correct. In the event a proper noun were reduced to a common, one could further presume that definitization would not be automatic, but would have to proceed in the same manner as in the case of "ordinary" common nouns. To test these presumptions, one would have to answer three basic questions: 1) Do "proper nouns" as such actually occur with determiners (other than zero)? 2) Are "proper nouns" always definite? and 3) If not, under what conditions are such nouns less than definite? Question 1 can be answered almost immediately upon examination of just a minimal amount of data; questions and 3 will bear more discussion, but can be answered simultaneously since they are inextricably related. Our answers to the latter questions will contain generalizations valid for all types of noun phrases which may be definitized in either English or Hungarian.

10.1.1 *The determiner as part of the name*. The qualification for proper noun status as quoted from *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* that such a noun "does not take a limiting modifier" leaves open the question whether to consider the determiner in such names, for example, as *the Hague*, *the Argentine*, *the Ukraine*, *the Mississippi*, *the United States*, *the Rocky Mountains*, etc., as a "limiting modifier." Are these forms less qualified as members of the proper noun class than, for example, *Paris*, *Argentina*, *Ukrania*, and the like? The answer to this question is obvious. Some proper nouns simply contain an article--the definite article, to be more exact--as an integral part of the name. This is true for Hungarian also. Without attempting to give an exhaustive list of such proper nouns for each language being discussed here,[1] I shall present a brief listing in the belief that a short comparative list of representative types may be of general interest, and that even a brief list would suffice to illustrate the tendency under discussion. For contrastive purposes, examples will also be given in which differences in article usage occur:

Type of Entity		*English*	*Hungarian*
Heavenly bodies		the North Star (the polestar)	a Sarkcsillag
		the Earth (earth)	a Föld (föld)
		the Great Bear	a Nagymedve
	also:	the Big Dipper	
	but:	Ursa Major	
		Mars, Venus, etc.	a Mars, a Vénus, etc.
Topographical names		the Atlantic (Ocean)	az Atlanti-óceán
		the Danube (River)	a Duna
		the Great Lakes	a Nagy Tavak
	but:	Lake Balaton	a Balaton
		the Alps	az Alpok
		the Caucasus (Caucasia)	a Kaukázus
	but:	Gellert Hill	a Gellért Hegy
Geo-political divisions		the Argentine (Argentina)	Argentina
	but:	the Ukraine (Ukrania)	Ukrajna
		the United States	az Egyesült Államok
		the Soviet Union	a Szovjetunió

Type of Entity	English	Hungarian
	the Union of South Africa	a Dél-afrika Unió
but:	the Hague	Hága
	the Hungarian Peoples Republic	A Magyar Népköztársaság
Cultural and/or commercial entities	the Academy	az Akadémia
	The Gellert (Hotel)	a Gellért
	the New York Stock Exchange	a new yorki értéktőzsde
	the Third Symphony	a III. szimfónia
	the Tragedy of Man	az ember tragédiája
	the Evening News	az Esti Hírlap
but:	Credit	Hitel (book title)
	Kossuth Cigarettes (Kossuths)	a Kossuth (cigareta)

This list could be extended almost at will, both in regard to illustrations of correspondences in occurrence of the article, and in contrasts. This would be especially true, of course, if one were to list a greater number of local or culturally-bound entities found in either language. In English, for example, names such as *the Toe*, *the Body*, nicknames for a football player and movie star respectively, abound at all levels of usage. Upon surveying the above short list, however, one can make several observations with regard to the more usual type of proper noun in both English and Hungarian. First of all, some categories of names, such as those of mountain ranges, rivers, oceans, etc., regularly occur with the article as part of the name, while other names, personal names in particular, lack the determiner. Secondly, if the name contains a qualifier as a constituent, then the definite article is almost invariably employed, for example, *the United States* (also *United States*), *az Egyesült Államok*. Thirdly, the article, or lack of it, may have a contrastive function, inasmuch as names of two separate entities may differ only in this respect, although in seemingly all cases a fuller name stands at the speaker's disposal which may be additionally employed to avoid ambiguity whenever necessary. Generally speaking, one of the contrasting names may be that of a person, while the other may be that of another entity named after the given person. However, this need not always be the case, as the second example here shows: Queen Elizabeth (the Second) vs. the Queen Elizabeth (ship), Missouri (state) vs. the Missouri (River), Conrad Hilton vs. the Conrad Hilton (Hotel), and so forth. A Hungarian example was given in the comparative list above: Kossuth (statesman) vs. a Kossuth (cigareta). Finally, although it certainly is more than coincidence that the definite article is the one usually selected to form a constituent of a proper name, the very presence or absence of the definite article with isolated occurrences of proper names says nothing in regard to the definiteness of the noun in question. To repeat an observation made considerably earlier in this work, definiteness is a syntactic category. It applies to noun phrases, common or otherwise, within the context of a discourse. Structurally speaking, a "proper noun" such as Mary is no more definite in isolation than a "common noun" such as mother. What is more, there are discourse situations in which both types of nouns may pattern identically, giving us justification for affording them the same status in the category of definiteness. We shall now examine "proper nouns," as defined above, to determine what variations in patterning occur in various types of contexts.

10.1.2 Syntactically-determined use of determiners with proper nouns. In addition to the fact that many proper nouns,

157

both in English and Hungarian, occur with the definite article as part of the name, it can be readily observed that there are contextually- (or syntactically-) determined uses of the article with proper nouns which ordinarily appear without an article in citation form. As indicated above, qualifying a proper noun generally entails the use of the definite article before the qualifier.[2] Since usage varies within one language in this respect, the possibilities for contrasting structures to occur when there are two languages involved are quite great. Therefore, we feel that these pattern types will require some sort of categorization for easier explication here. We shall start with the patterns occurring when a proper personal name is qualified.

10.1.2.1 Personal names qualified. As a rule, unqualified personal names do not occur with a definite determiner in English. In Hungarian, on the other hand, the definite article may--after certain conditions have been met--optionally occur with such names, even given names: (a) János 'John,' (a) Kovács Pista 'Steve Smith' and the like. This phenomenon will be discussed further below. What concerns us more immediately here is the fact that in those cases where qualifiers are used with proper nouns, the situation in respect to article usage changes somewhat. In Hungarian the definite article is now obligatory, while in English the use of the article is optional in some instances. It appears that if the qualifying attribute expresses a permanent quality of the individual in question, then no article is employed in English. Stress variation, in fact, indicates that the qualifier is often felt to be an integral part of the name: a kis Zsuzsi 'little (Little) Susie,' a hallgatag Kovács Pista 'silent (Silent) Steve Smith.' If, on the other hand, the qualification indicates a temporary state, English may employ the article also: (*the*) *vacationing Johnny Carson*, (*the*) *injured Bob Smith*, *the Young Stalin* (title of a book by Edward Ellis Smith), etc. There exists even the possibility of employing the indefinite article before such a qualifier indicating a temporary state:

a. 1. A serene and happy Mary accepted the invitation.
also: 2. Serene and happy, Mary accepted the invitation.
and 3. Mary, serene and happy, accepted the invitation.

The examples above illustrate what may be called a reflexive comparison, that is, a comparison of one phase of an individual's total development with another phase. It is, I believe, reasonable to label the nouns so qualified as proper nouns, although, of course, their status as definites is open to discussion. A similar type of qualification of such a proper name may not indicate two chronologically viewed aspects of an individual's life but rather a subjective view of the character of the individual in question. Several examples from popular literature in English are:

b. 1. The Other Dean Rusk (magazine article by Milton Vrorst)
2. There are two Richard Nixons (article by Art Buchwald)

Perhaps more often that not, the qualifier takes the form of a relative clause which, of course, follows the noun in English, the relative pronoun being optionally deleted when it occurs as an object in its clause. As will be indicated in sentences g.2, g.3, h.3, and h.4 in section 10.1.2.2 below, the Hungarian equivalent modifying structures may either precede or follow their head nouns. The following book titles--with suggested Hungarian equivalents--may serve to illustrate this tendency:

c. 1. The Roosevelt I have known (by Frances Perkins)
   2. A Roosevelt, akit én ismertem.

d. 1. The Bobby Kennedy Nobody Knows (by William Nicholas)
   2. A Kennedy Róbert, akit senki sem ismer.

After examining even the few examples given above, one must conclude that Fillmore's remark regarding the incompatibility of restrictive relative clauses with proper names must be amended in some way to account for the patterns illustrated in c.1 and d.1. In addition, all of the examples given above contain a proper noun which is preceded by a "limiting modifier." The presence of a limiting modifier therefore does not seem to be a sufficient condition for treating the given modified noun as common rather than proper. Since in actuality the very same individual is the referent for the name in each case, we cannot do more than label the noun in question a proper noun, the referent of which is considered from two points of view. As for the definiteness of such a proper noun, see 10.1.3 below. There are other cases of modified "proper nouns" in which the nouns involved are no longer to be considered legitimate proper nouns. These will be discussed after the following brief discussion of modified place names.

10.1.2.2 Place names qualified. From the Hungarian point of view it would not have been particularly necessary to make a separate category for modified place names, since these pattern, for the most part, just like modified personal names. From the point of view of English, however, several variations in patterning are to be observed with place names which do not generally occur with personal names. In the first place, although only modified personal names occur with an article as a rule, there are numbers of place names in English--whether qualified or not--which do occur with a definite article. Those place names in English which do not regularly occur with the article when unqualified, moreover, still show variations in patterning when they are modified, depending on the type of modification. Note the difference in article usage when two different types of prepositional phrase modifiers are used, for example:

a. 1. Paris in the 19th century ...
   2. The Paris of the 19th century ...

These examples have Hungarian equivalents which correspond fairly closely to the structural patterns of the English constructions, the adjectival modifier, however, most frequently occurring preposed:

b. 1. Párizs a 19. században ...
   2. A 19. századi Párizs ...

In fact, in almost all cases of modified place names, qualifiers are preposed in Hungarian with the definite article employed, while the English equivalents show varying patterns:

c. 1. az új Magyarország
   2. new Hungary (the new Hungary)

d. 1. a mai Magyarország
   2. the Hungary of today (?today's Hungary)

e. 1. a szabad Kína
   2. free China

Restrictive modifiers such as those above usually have full stress in either language, the whole pattern resembling an extended proper name. There seems to be no reason here for not construing the noun phrases here as proper nouns and as definite. However, it may be mentioned at this point in our discussion that "indefinite proper nouns" are also possible, as, for example, when a hypothetical referent is mentioned. An optional indefinite article occurs in the English construction of this type, while the zero determiner is preferred in Hungarian in some of these "reflexive comparison" patterns:

f. 1. (A) Paris without the Eiffel Tower would seem incomplete.
   2. Párizs az Eiffel-torony nélkül befejezetlennek látszana.

When the entity in question is considered in relation, not to itself, but to another entity, the indefinite article is possible in Hungarian also. Since the noun phrase involved undergoes a change in meaning, it can no longer be called a proper noun. Such nouns will be discussed in 10.2 below. Generally speaking, however, qualified place names in either language require the use of the definite article. The following basic example is illustrative of this tendency, and will form the core of a discussion in the next section:

g. 1. The Paris that we love[4] (title of a book by Maurois, Cousteau *et al.*)
   2. A Párizs, amelyet szeretünk
or: 3. A mi szeretett Párizsunk (lit.: Our beloved Paris)

It may be incidentally remarked here that a place name which already has an article as a constituent in English seems to appear with only one article. Those in Hungarian which have an article take the demonstrative under similar conditions, since there is an implied contrast present, the demonstrative being the preferred determiner before a noun occurring with a restrictive modifier:

h. 1. the Hague that I love ...
   2. ?the the Hague that I love ... (?the The Hague ...)
   3. a Hága, amelyet szeretek ...
or: 4. az én szeretett Hágám ...

i. 1. This isn't the United States that I used to know.
   2. Ez nem az az Egyesült Államok, amelyet én (valaha) ismertem.

162

Both the Hungarian and the English noun phrases here seem to pattern like common nouns in their use of determiners and restrictive modifiers. How this fact affects their status as definites will now be discussed.

10.1.3 *The status of definiteness of qualified proper nouns.* In considering the definiteness of proper nouns which are qualified as indicated above, one must return to the first part of the "working definition" of proper noun which was quoted above: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing ..." Upon examining the examples of modified proper nouns given in 10.1.2.2 above, it is reasonable to assert that, if the identity of "the particular being or thing" designated by a proper noun has been established in prior discourse, or is situationally (i.e., culturally) identifiable, then one must consider such a proper noun to be definite in the same way as a common noun. In all of the examples above--except f.1 and f.2, which will be discussed in 10.2--the same "particular being or thing" is being referred to, in the final analysis, as would be the case if the noun in question were not modified. The modification, of course, does seem to remove the proper noun from the total-definite category, but it seems that a proper name modified as above is just as definite as a common noun, for example, which is introduced together with its identifying clause, making the noun in question eligible for immediate definitization. Thus, the underlined (common) noun phrase in a.1 is just as definite as that in a.2, and in a similar fashion the underlined (proper) noun phrase in b.1 is just as definite as those in b.2:

a. 1. The story I am about to tell is true.
   2. I am about to tell a story. The story I am about to tell is true.[5]

b. 1. The Paris that we love ...
   2. We love (a city named) Paris. The Paris that we love ...

In other words, once the identity of the real-world referent for the noun Paris is known in the discourse situation, the noun in question (here with zero determiner) is to be considered definite when being subsequently referred to, even though it lacks an unambiguous marker of definiteness. In sentences b.1 and b.2 above the same legitimate discourse referent is meant. Accordingly, each occurrence of the noun is to be considered a proper noun, and ought to be considered definite, even though this would seemingly violate the rule that proper nouns do not co-occur with restrictive clauses. However, this "violation"[6] poses no problem at all, since we have already seen that other definite noun phrases, those which are used as partitives, do collocate with restrictive clauses. In fact, there seems to be no reason for not considering any proper noun qualified as above as "partial-definite" inasmuch as there always seems to be a dichotomy, either expressed overtly or implicit, in such qualification. Note, for example, the other Dean Rusk. In the case of any noun phrase with restrictive modification, there seems to be a partial vs. total contrast implied: "The X, as modified, opposed to all other X." A previous sentence can furnish us with a good example here: "The story I am about to tell" as opposed to "all other possible stories." This total-vs.-partial dichotomy is the key to our analysis of proper nouns and--as mentioned repeatedly--of all noun phrases which can be made definite, and will be an essential ingredient of our reworked definition of proper noun as given in 10.4 below. To arrive at our new definition of the category "proper noun," we need to discuss another use of so-called proper names which appear to be proper nouns at first glance, but which upon closer inspection are found to be no more than common nouns which have rather restricted semantic domains.

10.2 "Proper names" as common nouns

When nouns such as John, Mary Jones, or Paris, traditionally called "proper nouns" or "proper names," are used with no "particular being or thing" being referred to as such, then we have a semantic and syntactic situation in which it is no longer valid to label such nouns "proper nouns." They may be called "reduced proper nouns" to distinguish them from "real" or "true" proper nouns which have met certain conditions of definiteness to be discussed below. Structurally speaking, reduced proper nouns pattern exactly in the same fashion as ordinary common nouns and may be, in fact, definite or indefinite, depending on the discourse situation. We shall explore the two main types of such reduced proper nouns.

10.2.1 Reduced proper name meaning "person or thing having the name X." One obviously very common use of a "proper name" reduced to common noun in English indicates that the speaker is not referring to a particular person or thing as such, but is referring to the name itself. Thus, we can say, for example:

a. 1. There were two Mary Smiths at the party last night.
2. In fact, there were three Marys altogether.

That the name itself, and not any particular individual, is the main topic of the sentence is evidenced further by the very common alternate pattern in which the unambiguous form named is inserted in front of the reduced proper noun. Thus, the underlined noun phrases in the sentences in a. above could be unambiguously reworded as follows:

b. 1. two persons named Mary Smith
   2. three persons named Mary

In Hungarian reduced common nouns may also be employed, but in structures parallel to those in b. and not in a. The tendency in Hungarian to prepose qualifiers is followed in this instance also:

c. 1. két Mary Smith nevű lány
   2. három Mary nevű lány

Such common nouns based on proper names--as is the case with all common nouns--may occur in the singular, of course, either as partitives, i.e., as one of a previously-mentioned group, or as an independent (i.e., "introductory") indefinite. As partitives the reduced proper nouns are found in much the same contrasting pattern types in English and Hungarian as given immediately above:

d. 1. One Mary Smith was wearing a black dress.
   2. Egy Mary Smith nevű lány fekete ruhát viselt.

As independent indefinites, on the other hand, the Hungarian reduced common nouns may occur in patterns which follow the English more closely:

e. 1. a (certain) Mr. Smith
   2. egy bizonyos Smith nevű úr

From the contrastive point of view it should be mentioned that while an "indefinite" adjective (or determiner) like certain is optional in the English construction, bizonyos 'certain' or some similar qualifier is required in the Hungarian indefinite construction. Other independent indefinite determiners may be used in either language, of course, but the effect achieved is the same: direct reference to a particular person is circumvented, that is to say, "proper noun status" is not afforded the individual in question for various subjective reasons. The following examples, then, are also to be found:

f. 1. one Mr. Smith
   2. bizonyos Smith nevű úr

g. 1. a certain Mr. Smith
   2. valami Smith úr

h. 1. some Colonel Brown or other
   2. valamiféle Brown ezredes

It is obvious from these examples that the reduced proper nouns here all have the basic semantic import of "person named X." The examples above showed these proper-noun-based common nouns in their indefinite forms only. It goes without saying that if they are common nouns, then they may be definite also. This fact will be discussed after another widely distributed use of reduced common nouns is discussed.

10.2.2 *Reduced proper name meaning "person or thing having the qualities of X."* Another type of reduced proper noun is to be found in both English and Hungarian. This type is used to indicate that the *qualities* of a famous person or place are being singled out, not the person or thing as an individual entity. Examples of this phenomenon are abundant at all levels of usage in English and Hungarian. Although only literary examples are given here, one need only substitute the name of a famous movie star, athlete, scientist, or what have you, into the pattern to make it applicable to practically any field of human endeavor:

a. 1. A Shakespeare isn't born every century.
2. Egy Shakespeare nem minden században születik.

b. 1. They say he's another Byron.
2. Azt mondják, hogy ő egy másik Byron.

For reasons of comparison it might be reiterated here that Hungarian often has zero instead of the indefinite article egy whenever an unspecified, indefinite noun--non-count noun or otherwise--occurs in any function in a sentence:

c. 1. Adyt látnak benne.[7]
2. They see an Ady in him.

It will be noted that the indefinite conjugation is used here, while otherwise the definite conjugation would be expected to occur with a true proper noun as the direct object. It goes without saying that place names may also be used to indicate reference to the quality of a particular entity rather than the entity itself. Accordingly, the sentence immediately below would be considered a banality if interpreted analytically, that is, if Paris is interpreted as a "real" proper noun:

d. 1. This city is not (a) Paris. (or: This city is no Paris)
2. Ez a város nem (egy) Párizs.

However, when viewed synthetically, that is, when Paris is interpreted correctly as a reduced proper noun, then the sentence adequately conveys the speaker's opinion in regard to the qualities of the city under discussion. The following sentence achieves the same effect:

e. 1. I wouldn't exchange my home town even for a Paris.
2. Egy Párizsért sem cserelem az én szülővárosomat.

It is quite apparent that a Paris in the last two English sentences is equivalent in meaning to the common noun phrase "a city of the qualities of Paris," and is to be regarded as indefinite here in the same way as a city would be if it were inserted into the sentence in its place. The question as to just when a proper noun is actually definite, then, still remains to be answered, and will form the concluding part of the discussions presented in this chapter.

10.3 The status of proper nouns in the category of definiteness

As can be seen from the above discussions, a proper noun in the strictest sense, that is, a noun actually referring to "a particular being or thing," is ambiguous with respect to definiteness, occurring sometimes with a zero determiner and unrestricted, and, of course, sometimes with a determiner and a restrictive clause. Now we have already discussed in 10.1.3 the fact that the latter type of (real) proper noun is to be considered as definite as a "definitized" common noun with a following restrictive clause. Just as an ordinary common noun may be definite (i.e., "partial-definite") when used as a partitive or when accompanied by its identifying sentence embedded as a relative clause--the latter type of construction also makes a contrast of partiality vs. totality--so also may a proper noun be restricted when two aspects of the individual person or thing are being considered. Now it will be shown that even a true proper noun must fulfill the very same conditions for definiteness as ordinary common nouns.

10.3.1 Proper nouns as definites. I believe it is clear now that a "proper noun" in the traditonal sense, that is to say, the category of nouns which include reduced proper nouns and real proper nouns, may range in definiteness from independent indefinite to definite. We may now eliminate from discussion here those reduced proper nouns which we showed in paragraph

10.2.1 to pattern as indefinite common nouns. This leaves us with reduced proper nouns which pattern as definites and real proper nouns, which, as we shall see, may pattern as "total-definites" and as "partial-definites" (see 10.1.2).

10.3.1.1 Proper nouns and previous mention. In order for a (real or reduced) proper noun to be definite, its referent must be previously identified. Just as in the case of common nouns, this identification may stem from prior discourse, or may be tacit mutual knowledge within the situation in which the discourse is taking place. Accordingly, the isolated form Joe, for example, or even Henry Jones, has little more meaning than the noun phrase a man or even a man named Henry Jones, unless the particular individual referred to by such a name is mutually known by the speaker and the hearer. Saying, for example, "Joe's coming over tonight" to an audience which is not acquainted with the individual the speaker has in mind is exactly equivalent to saying "The man is coming over tonight" without prior identification, although, of course, both sentences are grammatically well formed and, from the speaker's point of view, definite. However, just as the latter sentence would evoke from the listeners requests for proper identification such as "What man?" or "Who's that?" etc., so also would the first statement induce questions such as "Who's Joe?" or "Joe who?" In either case the necessary identification would have to be given on the spot. In the case of mutual acquaintances, on the other hand, no such identification is necessary; otherwise the speaker must establish a referent in prior discourse before such a name is apprehended as a proper noun. This, of course, brings up the possibility of partiality of reference vs. totality of reference in the case of previously-mentioned proper nouns. We shall now discuss this possibility.

10.3.1.2 Proper nouns and totality. As a seemingly necessary corollary to the process of proper identification of proper nouns as well as common nouns is the fact that the feature of totality must be present in the subsequent reference. For example, if there are two persons of the same name, say Joe Smith, within the circle of acquaintances of a given speaker and his audience, then the sentence "Joe Smith is coming over tonight" is obviously ambiguous. The referent underlying the proper noun Joe Smith is actually only partially identified. The field of possible referents is narrowed down to two choices. Definiteness being such an all-pervading feature of the grammar of English (and Hungarian), an ambiguous statement such as the one above would undoubtedly stimulate information-seeking questions such as "Which Joe Smith?" or "Which one?" The answer to such a question would again be what one must label "partial-definite," at best: "The Joe Smith who lives down the street," or "The one who lives down the street." Thus, a proper noun used as a partitive, that is, used to refer to only some of a number of previously-mentioned or situationally identified entities, is structurally no more definite than any partial-definite common noun. As we have seen, the same determiners and the same type of restrictive modification are used in either case. This holds, of course, for reduced proper nouns also when they refer to part of collective or multiple, previously-mentioned or situationally-identified entities.

10.3.1.3 *Reduced proper nouns as definites*. The pattern exhibited by a partial-definite real proper noun, having *the* as its determiner and a restrictive clause following the noun, is almost indistinguishable from that of a reduced proper noun used in a situation allowing definitization. While in 10.2.1 and 10.2.2 we discussed situations in which reduced common nous appeared primarily as indefinites, there is always the possibility for thse common nouns to be definitized just as ordinary common nouns. Thus, the sentence given in the previous paragraph, "The Joe Smith who lives down the street," could, in fact, be a continuation of a discourse in which *Joe Smith* occurred as a reduced common noun in an introductory sentence sufficient for definitization. Thus, a discourse of the following type:

a. 1. There are three Joe Smiths living in this area. One of them lives down the street.
2. The Joe Smith who lives down the street is a doctor.

can be distinguished from one as outlined above only by the fact that in the former instance the two individuals bearing the name in question are *mutually* known to speaker and hearer, that is, they have been previously identified, while the individuals as such in the second instance are of lesser importance than the name, although it may be argued that once the proper name *as name* has been mentioned, the attention of speaker and hearer turns to the individual bearing the name. This may be more a philosophical problem than a linguistic one, but there are certainly examples to be found in which the distinction between reduced proper nouns and true proper nouns used as partitives is clear enough to warrant the subcategorization. Thus, in the following examples, the meaning 'person having the name or quality of the famous person named X" is present to varying degrees, as the paraphrases in parentheses indicate, in the reduced proper nouns, which in some instances are definite through prior identification in the discourse or are known in the situation in which the discourse is taking place:

b. 1. There were three Marys at the party last night.
2. *The Mary* who was the prettiest was the most popular.

This definite reduced proper noun is actually partial-definite, of course, since it represents only a part of the multiple referent. Other examples could be given, however, in which the reduced proper noun is unique, hence total, and, at the same time, is so unambiguously identified in the discourse situation as to be considered unambiguously definite:

c. 1. *My Paul* is smarter than your *Paul*. (i.e., *son named Paul*)
2. He was considered to be *the Byron* of his time. (i.e., *the* poet who best exemplified the qualities of the famous poet named Byron)

In sentence c.1 we have an example of what is variously called the "genitive article," "possessive adjective" or "possessive determiner." Whichever term one uses, I believe it is reasonable to assert that *my* and *your* are a type of *definite* determiner here. Since these possessive forms will be discussed at length in the following chapter, we may exclude them from further discussion at this time in favor of a discussion of *the* as it appears in c.2. This stressed determiner requires a digressive explanation here as it shows a special use of the definite article as an unsupported superlative which expresses the greatest aggregation of the best qualities expected of the type of individual mentioned. This particular use of the definite article is to be found in Hungarian also, according to my informant, who furnished the following example:

d. 1. A század elején Ady volt a magyar költő.
2. At the beginning of the century Ady was the Hungarian poet.

The superlative meaning attached to the definite article in c.2 above, however, should not detract from the fact that the use of the definite article here still implies a contrast with an indefinite reduced common noun, a Byron, or another Byron, in such sentences as:

e. 1. He is considered to be another Byron.
2. He has the romanticism of a Byron.

It goes without saying that both definite and indefinite versions of the reduced proper noun Byron in these examples show all of the structural characteristics of any common noun. The only apparent difference is graphemic, which may detract from the obvious common-nounness of the noun in question. The above examples, however, have shown that there is a variety of determiner choices in the case of reduced proper nouns, but only a binary choice in the case of true proper nouns, as we shall now see.

10.3.2 Real proper nouns and determiners. We have seen that reduced proper nouns may occur with a variety of "limiting modifiers" in English: a, the, my, another, a certain, etc., while true proper nouns may occur with the if the given noun is qualified. Now aside from the fact that many place names have a definite article as one of their regular constituents, and that nicknames often have a determiner in them, it should be borne in mind that the vast majority of proper names--especially personal names--occur with zero when unqualified, in English at any rate. A properly identified, unique or total proper noun in particular tends to have the zero determiner in English: Joe, Joe Smith and the like, when the given individuals designated by the names are known by speaker and hearer. It is interesting to note that in Hungarian, on the other hand, a similarly-identified proper noun can occur with the definite article: a Jóska 'Joe,' a Kovács Pista 'Steve Smith,' and the like. To sum up: when the speaker and hearer know the identity of the individual who is designated by a given proper name in a given discourse, that proper name will generally occur with zero in English. The corresponding noun phrase equivalent in Hungarian, however, could have an optional definite article before the given proper name. With these latter details in mind, we may now propose an improved definition of "proper noun."

10.4 Improved definition of proper noun

After this rather lengthy discussion of various uses of so-called proper nouns, we are prepared to offer a definition of proper noun which will hopefully eliminate narrowness as to occurrence with determiners, and at the same time exclude reduced proper nouns.

10.4.1 The basic definition. A "real" proper noun is hereby considered to be "a noun which designates, not a quality or name as such, but a particular individual or thing which has been previously identified or is situationally (or culturally) known in the discourse context."

10.4.2 Corollary one. A real proper noun which represents the totality of its underlying referent may be designated "total-definite," and may or may not have a determiner as a regular constituent of the name. On the other hand, a proper noun which designates only part of a previously mentioned or understood group of entities may be termed "partial-definite," and usually occurs with the definite article in English in addition to the restrictive element, which may be a relative clause.

10.4.3 Corollary two. Other "proper nouns" which are derived from names of individual persons or things are designated "reduced proper nouns" and are considered to be no more than common nouns, homophonous with real proper nouns, but having functions as varied as any common noun. These reduced proper nouns, of course, may be either definite or indefinite, again, as may almost any other common noun.

NOTES TO CHAPTER X

1. The entry under *the* in *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* contains many such examples scattered throughout. For Hungarian, one can consult the *Értelmező szótár I*, pages 5a and 6, where the definite article and proper noun combinations are treated in a separate section. Most of the following Hungarian examples are taken from this work.

2. Except in the case of the name of a ruler, where the qualifier is actually part of the name: *Elizabeth the Second*, *Charles the Fair*, etc.

3. This example is from Hathaway (1967:106).

4. However, one can also find *Unknown Oman* by Wendell Phillips, *Unknown Hungary* by V. Tissot, etc., along with *The Real Ireland* by C.H. Bretherton.

5. It does seem to be the case that the only restrictive clause that may follow a *total*-definite noun phrase is a repetition of the identifying context, as in this example.

6. Another apparent "violation" of this rule is the pattern (a type of "cleft-sentence pattern") shown, for example, in the following sentence: "It is Paul who does the most work around here." An equivalent form of this sentence is "Paul is the one who does the most work around here," which more clearly shows the partial-anaphoric nature of the reference, previous mention having supplied the given multiple referent.

7. Example from Tompa (1962:158).

CHAPTER XI

POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

11.0 Introduction

Possessive constructions[1] in both English and Hungarian are considered to be definite by three of the authors quoted in the Introduction to this study. Smith (1964:37) even attributes a greater degree of definiteness to possessives than to non-possessive definite nouns: "my book is more definite than the book." Fillmore (1964:96) chooses a possessive construction of limited syntactic variability to prove a point: "... restrictive relative clauses are not attached to definite nouns like MY WIFE ..." Finally, Bánhidi, Jókay, and Szabó (1965:112-13) simply give a falsifiable generalization regarding the definiteness of possessives in Hungarian: "The object is considered definite ... if the object is a noun to which a possessive suffix has been added ..." It is almost a truism to say that in linguistic analysis such unqualified generalizations as these are bound to be falsified by almost inevitable counterexamples of various sorts. In this chapter we will test these general statements by examining various possessive constructions in English and Hungarian, and will conclude by offering for consideration statements relating to the definiteness of possessives which will account for the various counterexamples discussed here.

Leaving aside the restricted use of possessive markers with real or reduced proper nouns in English and Hungarian (see 10.3.1.3), for example, our beloved Paris, mi szeretett Párizsunk, we shall deal here primarily with possessive constructions composed of two common nouns which are in a certain syntactic relation to each other. For the sake of convenience for the interested reader, the following paradigm of Hungarian possessive forms is given together with its nearest English equivalent:

autóm	autóim	my car	my cars
autód	autóid	your (sg.) car	your cars
autója	autói	his (etc.) car	his cars
autónk	autóink	our car	our cars
autótok	autóitok	your car	your cars
autójuk	autóik	their car	their cars

It must be borne in mind, however, that the above example shows one of the most basic possessive paradigms in Hungarian and that the majority of such paradigms are much more complex morphologically. Moreover, since there is quite an extensive semantic potential to the possessive constructions in either language being studied here, it should not be surprising that interlingual possibilities for comparison and contrast are also quite numerous. Accordingly, we will not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the whole area of possessive constructions in either language. We will ignore, in particular, the morphological complexity of the various paradigms of the possessive in Hungarian,[2] and will rather select from each language those possessive patterns which we feel have the most direct bearing on the category of definiteness.

11.1 Situational identification of possessives

One of the most obvious syntactic features of the possessive construction in both English and Hungarian is the fact that they can be used to initiate an utterance and be fully comprehended, that is, they are situationally identifiable and do not necessarily require previous mention. One certainly can say, for example:

a. 1. *My father* is a millionaire.
or 2. *My wife* is a nurse.

without having to say, for example:

b. 1. I have *a father*.
2. I have *a wife*.

However, one feature of these particular noun phrases stands out immediately when one is considering their relationship to the category of definiteness, namely, they are singular, hence total, by our cultural standards at any rate. Such noun phrases, of course, must be considered to be total-definite through situational identification. If, on the other hand, we select a type of noun which may readily have a plural or collective referent underlying it, then we encounter the dichotomy which is almost omnipresent in the category of definiteness: partiality vs. totality of reference. From this point of view we shall now examine several instances where less culturally-bound possessives occur with the possibility of partial reference.

11.1.1 *Totality vs. partiality of reference with possessives*. Although possessives such as *my father* or *my wife* certainly ought to be considered definite, there is no inherent reason why all such possessives denoting kinship should be total-definite. It goes without saying that if an individual has more than one brother, for example, he may refer to a particular one in contradistinction to all of the others. As we have seen previously, this total vs. partitive distinction can be expressed in English by the use of non-restrictive clauses vs. restrictive clauses, the other elements in the sentence being equal. Thus, for example, an individual with only one brother might say:

a. 1. My brother, who lives in Chicago, is a doctor.

while another individual who has more than one could say:

2. My brother who lives in Chicago is a doctor.

and imply, at the least, that he has a brother who does not live in Chicago and who may or may not be a doctor. Presumably the latter is true. To return to one of the examples of (total-definite) possessives quoted at the beginning of this chapter, one could find cultural situations in which my wife could also readily occur as a partitive in the same way as my brother does as given above. A polygamous Moslem, for example, certainly could make a distinction between wives by the use of restrictive modification, for example:

b. 1. My wife who comes from X ...

compared to: 2. My wife who comes from Z ...

However, this is just an incidental cultural matter that should not detract from the main point we are trying to make here, namely, that, granted that some possessive constructions are to be considered definite through situational identification, there are nonetheless situations in which definite possessives in English are only partitives, in which case they may co-occur with restrictive clauses, as do ordinary non-possessive noun phrases. Hungarian also has contrasting structures in which possessives show partial vs. total reference. However, as we have indicated at several places in this study, the contrast between totality and partiality is indicated, not by different clause types in Hungarian, but rather by determiner and/or conjugation type. The use of the definite conjugation indicates the presence of a total-definite object, regardless of how the direct object is otherwise marked. Conversely, the use of the indefinite conjugation with an object which would otherwise pattern as definite indicates a partiality of reference. In this way the use of the indefinite conjugation in effect overrides all markers for the total-definite category with the exception of the definite article. Possessives, for example, may or may not be total-definite, but noun phrases marked with the definite article always are. Possessives not marked with the definite article, then, may contrast in definiteness, the endings of the conjugation types carrying the necessary structural difference:

c. 1. Két lovát elad*ta*. (def.) (compare: Mindkét lovát elad*ta*.
2. He sold his two horses. He sold both his horses.)

d. 1. Két lovát elad*ott*. (indef.)(compare: Két lovát elad*ott*.
2. He sold two of his horses. He sold two horses.)

However, the total vs. partial contrast here could be actually marked by the use of the definite article, making the use of the definite conjugation redundant, so to speak, rather than contrastive:

e. 1. A két lovát elad*ta*. (or: Mindkét lovát ...
2. He sold his two horses. ... both (of) his horses.)

The absence of the definite article with the possessive in Hungarian is therefore not an infallible indication of the exact level of definiteness of the noun phrase in question since not only total-definite and partial-definite, but also (introductory) indefinite possessives may appear with zero. (See 11.1.2). The use of the total-definite possessive without the definite article seems to be much more prevalent in written styles, especially in sentence-initial position (Bánhidi *et al*. 1965:149). Colloquial styles almost invariably employ the definite article before total-definite possessives, except in forms used in direct address:

f. 1. A fiam orvos.
2. My son is a doctor.

but: g. 1. Hova mégy, fiam?
2. Where are you going, (my) son/boy?

For contrastive purposes it might be incidentally noted here that the use of possessive forms in direct address is more prevalent in Hungarian than in English, as g.1 and g.2 indicate. Formal speeches in Hungarian, for example, often begin with the possessive formula Hölgyeim és uraim! '(my) ladies and gentlemen!', and gentlemen on the street may be addressed by strangers with Uram! '(my) sir!' Since these vocatives seem to be total possessives in the discourse situation in which they are employed, one must consider them to be total-definite, even though such forms have a very limited syntactic range, making it difficult to test their status of definiteness structurally.

11.1.2 Possessives marked with indefinite determiners.

It is quite obvious--as we have shown in previous chapters--that partiality of reference may be indicated by means other than restrictive modifiers in English, and the use of the indefinite conjugation in Hungarian. One of the most notable is the use of "indefinite" determiners. The use of such determiners with possessives confuses the issue of establishing a structural distinction between partial-definite and indefinite, which we have previously noted to be tenuous at best. This is particularly true in English, where, because of the fact that possessives as such are in a sense situationally identified at all times, partiality, just as much as indefiniteness, seems to be a primary consideration in the use of "indefinite" determiners in such cases. In Hungarian, on the other hand, partiality may be kept separate from indefiniteness in possessives by the use of contrasting determiners, as we shall see in 11.1.2.2.

11.1.2.1 Indefinite determiners with possessives in English. There seems to be an inseparable mixture of indefiniteness and partiality in the use of the preposition phrase of plus possessive pronoun. There is certainly an indication of partiality in such phrases as, for example: a friend of mine, some/several/two (etc.) friends of mine, and the like. However, native American-English-speaking informants agree that this pattern does not seem to be as explicitly partitive as, for example: one/some/several/two (etc.) of my friends, and the like, where the implication that the speaker has more friends than mentioned is clearer. However, what concerns us most here is the fact that both pattern types are equally indefinite structurally, and thus are essentially indistinguishable--except for the type of determiner used--from the partitive pattern discussed above.

11.1.2.2 Hungarian "indefinite" possessive patterns. Hungarian has an interesting choice of determiners with possessive constructions which allows not only an indefinite-partitive, but also a type of definite-partitive which is quite different from the usual patterning of partitives as indefinites. As an introductory indefinite, a possessive may be marked with the indefinite article egy, while as a partitive it may take the "possessive form" of the indefinite article, egyik. Egyik is like melyik "which" in that it expressedly denotes a choice from among a restricted or generally known number of entities, and therefore patterns as a definite. Indeed, egyik most often occurs with the definite article, as in b.1, for example:

a. 1. *Egy barátom* érkezik ma Londonból.
2. *A friend of mine* is arriving from London today.
(*a my friend)

b. 1. *Az egyik barátom érkezik ma Londonból.*
2. *One of my friends* is arriving from London today.
(*the one friend of mine)

The partitiveness of *egyik* may be more overtly shown when this form itself bears a possessive suffix and follows the plural referent of which it represents a part:

c. 1. a barátaim *egyike*
2. *one* of my friends

Both (*az*) *egyik* and *egyike* require the use of the definite conjugation when used as the object of a transitive verb, while *egy* does not:

d. 1. Azután felhív*om* (*az*) *egyik* osztálytársamat.
but: 2. Azután felhív*ok* *egy* osztálytársamat.
3. Then I'm going to call up *one of my* classmates.
and: 4. Then I'm going to call up *a* classmate *of mine*.

11. *Previous mention with possessive constructions*

Possessive constructions in either language may be used in sentences which follow a prior mentioning of the referents underlying the possessives. We have already seen that if the subsequent reference is total, the possessive is usually marked by the definite article in Hungarian, while the equivalent in English is generally marked by the use of the "possessive adjective" ("genitive article") in addition to the inability to collocate with a restrictive clause (however, see 1.2.2 above.). Thus *a kalapom* 'my hat' is total definite, by virtue of situational identification if no previous mention has been made in regard to the object in question. In cases where there is previous mention, however, such previous mention takes on different formal characteristics in the two languages being analyzed here and is worthy of special discussion at this point in our study.

11.2.1 *English introductory possessive constructions.* Whenever it is felt necessary to introduce a possessive in English, speakers generally make use of the indefinite article with the otherwise unmarked noun phrase. As indicated previously, the semantic range of the possessive constructions is quite extensive so that not all possible situations can be covered by example here. However, several examples should suffice to indicate several possible introductory patterns of possessive constructions used in various ways. We will at the same time give examples of subsequent reference where, it will be noted, the definite article in the place of the genitive article is also possible:

a. 1. I was wearing *a hat* when I came in.
   2. *My*/The *hat* is dark blue.

b. 1. We're waiting for *a train*.
   2. *Our*/The *train* is 20 minutes late.

c. 1. We have just formed *a* new *club*.
   2. *Our*/The *club* is open to anyone.

It can be noted that the second sentence in each pair, in addition to having the possibility of using *the* to indicate the definite noun phrase previously mentioned, may also serve more or less as a discourse-initiating sentence by itself if the possessive determiner is selected. The latter possibility depends, of course, on the given discourse situation.

11.2.2 *Introductory possessive constructions in Hungarian.* In contrast to English, the Hungarian language uses introductory possessives which may already be marked as possessive:

a. 1. *Kalapom* van.   (or: Van kalapom.)
   2. I have a *hat*.

b. 1. *Autóm* van.   (or: Van autóm.)
   2. I have a car.

It goes without saying, however, that, of the variety of uses to which possessive constructions are put in Hungarian, the above instances represent only a small minority of the introductory possibilities. To even attempt to list all possible underlying structures for possessive constructions used in varying ways would require securing examples from a vast number of fields of human endeavor. This we cannot do in such a limited study as this, but, be that as it may, the introductory patterns observed generally have some sort of indefinite determiner, a notable example being zero, as we have seen. In a.1 and a.2 above, in fact, it seems that the only indefinite determiners which could readily substitute for zero would be the quantitative determiners such as *egy* 'one,' *két* 'two,' *néhány* 'several,' etc. The above possessives, *kalapom* and *autóm*, are consequently to be treated as indefinites since they occur in a slot which is generally filled by indefinites only. Therefore, stating the existence of a possessed hat, for example, by the use of this syntactic frame is parallel to stating the existence of any non-possessed (indefinite) noun of similar syntactic features:

c. 1. *Asztal* van a szobában.
   2. There's *a* *table* in the room.

d. 1. *Két/néhány* *asztal* van a szobában.
   2. There are *two/several* tables in the room.

Using, on the other hand, a noun phrase--whether a possessive or non-possessive--which is overtly marked as definite in this frame would result in a non-grammatical pattern:

e. 1. *Az asztal van.
2. *The table is.

f. 1. *A kalapom van.
2. *My hat is.

The closest acceptable pattern in which definites occur would require the use of a prefix and would accordingly differ in meaning:

g. 1. Az asztal megvan.
2. The table is (here/at hand/available/found, etc.).

h. 1. A kalapom megvan.
2. I have my hat.

It is obvious then that only indefinites fill the pattern shown in a.1 and a.2. It is quite apparent also that indefinites--either marked for possession or not--are the forms used to introduce possessive constructions in quite a few other situations.

11.3 Possessive pronouns

The forms called possessive pronouns are undoubtedly the clearest example of possessive forms used after previous mention. Indeed, they are total-definite anaphoric pronouns which may be used only after previous mention has established the identity of the entities to which they refer. Disregarding morphological peculiarities, the following list of Hungarian possessive pronouns (singular possessed) is given for the convenience of the reader who may wish to compare these with the possessive markers used with noun phrases given in 5.0:

az enyém	mine	(also:	kié?	whose?
a tied	yours		Jánosé	John's)
az övé	his/hers/its			
a miénk	ours			
a tietek	yours			
az övék	theirs			

Inasmuch as the use of the markers to indicate plural possession in Hungarian does not seem to have any additional bearing on the category of definiteness, they are left out of consideration here. Nevertheless, even from the above minimum paradigm one can observe that the total-definiteness of the Hungarian possessive pronouns is felt to such an extent that they are used only in conjunction with the definite article. This is in contrast with the optional use of the article with possessive noun phrases, as we have seen. Moreover, the definite article occurs with the possessive pronouns (except, of course, the interrogative *kié*?) regardless of the function the pronoun has in the sentence. If the possessive pronoun is the object of the verb, the use of the definite conjugation is called for:

a. 1. *A tied* ez a kalap, vagy (a) Jánosé?
   2. Is this hat *yours* or John's?

b. 1. Nem *az enyém*, hanem *az övé*.
   2. It's not *mine*, but *his*.

c. 1. *Az enyém* ott az asztalon van.
   2. *Mine* is there on the table.

d. 1. Nem látom a *tied*(*et*).
   2. I don't see *yours*.

e. 1. *Kiét* tartja a kezében?
   2. *Whose* is he holding?

To summarize the facts brought out here: the possessive pronouns in either language are total-definite anaphoric pronouns *par excellence*. They may be used to state the fact of ownership of an entity previously mentioned in the discourse, or obviously identified in the situation in which the discourse is taking place, as in, for example, sentences a.1 and a.2, or they may be used as total substitutes for a previously-identified noun phrase, as in the sentences in d. and e. above. Whenever they can be tested structurally, they are found to pattern as total definites.

11.4 *Other pronouns with possessive suffixes in Hungarian*

There are other pronominal forms in Hungarian which may take possessive suffixes--often affecting their status of definiteness thereby--and which may or may not have "possessive" equivalents in English. These forms in Hungarian come under the general headings of quantitative pronouns and indefinite pronouns. The former type has already been discussed fairly extensively above. Accordingly, we need only to summarize briefly the pertinent points about these pronominal forms which have a more or less direct bearing on the category of definiteness. Then we shall conclude this chapter with a short discussion on the use of the indefinite pronouns with possessive suffixes.

11.4.1 *Quantitative pronouns with possessive suffixes.*

As we have shown in 6.1.6, possessive suffixes may be added to quantitative pronouns which are used in non-subject position. The possessive pronouns thus formed, e.g., *kettejük* 'two of them,' subsequently behave in much the same manner as possessive nouns in regard to definiteness, that is, total reference is considered definite, while partial reference is indefinite. Two examples which were already cited may illustrate this point:

a. 1. *Hármónkat* kiválasztott. (also *hármunkat*)
   2. He chose *three of us*.

b. 1. Kiválasztotta *hármónkat*. (also *hármunkat*)
   2. He chose *all three of us*.

It can be seen here that *hármónkat* in b.1, used in total reference, governs the use of the definite conjugation, while the similar form in a.1, which is a partitive here, takes the indefinite conjugation. The latter type of government, of course, is the usual with all *personal* pronouns of the first and second persons. Compare a.1 with the following sentence which also shows indefinite patterning:

c. 1. *Minket* kiválasztott.
2. He chose *us.*

While a first person personal pronoun like *minket* is always indefinite, and a possessive form like *hármónkat* is definite or indefinite depending on the total or partitive relationship to its referent, there are other first person pronominal forms which are ambivalent in regard to definiteness depending on the form of the *subject* of the transitive verb. The quantitative pronouns built on the semantically "total" stem *mindnyáj-* 'all' when affixed with the possessive suffixes of the first or second persons may be either definite or indefinite--with no apparent contrast in meaning--when a third person subject is present (see d.1 and d.2). On the other hand, when these object forms are used with a verb which has first or second persons as the subject, then the definite conjugation is used, thus signalling the reflexive relationship:

d. 1. Lát *mindnyájunkat.* (indef.)
or: 2. Látja *mindnyájunkat.* (def.)
3. He sees *all of us.*

but: e. 1. Látom *mindnyájunkat.* (def.)
2. I see *all of us.*

As is to be expected, the third person form *mindnyájukat* 'all of them' patterns with the definite conjugation, regardless of subject type. Partitives in the third person, on the other hand, may be formed with other quantitative pronominal stems, and show the usual partial-definite pattern that we have seen repeatedly:

f. 1. *Kettejüket* kiválasztott.
   2. He chose *two* *of* *them*.

g. 1. *Kettejüket* kiválasztot*ta*. (def.) (also: Mindkettejüket ...)
   2. He chose *both* *of* *them*.

The ambivalent anaphoric nature of *kettejük*, that is partial vs. total, is in obvious contrast to the total-anaphoric nature of *mindnyájukat* 'all of them,' although, as we have seen, an anaphoric form need not be absolutely specific in order to be considered (total) definite. We have already observed that *melyiket*, for example, consistently patterns as a definite, as does its English equivalent *which* (*one*). It goes without saying, then, that we can expect a definite patterning when *melyik* itself is appended with possessive suffixes of the third person:

h. 1. *Melyiküket* látod?
   2. *Which* *one* *of* *them* do you see?

even if it is prefixed by the indefinite formative *vala*- 'some':

i. 1. *Valamelyiküket* látom, de nem tudom, hogy hogy hívják.
   2. I see (*some*) *one* *of* *them*, but I don't know his name.

In all of the cases in this section the English equivalents seem to pattern as partial-definites, although other environments would have to be created for them to test their compatibility with restrictive clauses. However, the last three Hungarian pronominal forms discussed here contrast, in their constant definiteness, with the seemingly permanent indefinite pronouns, which, even though they may have possessive suffixes attached to them. always pattern as indefinites.

11.4.2 *Indefinite* *pronouns* *with* *possessive* *suffixes*. Indefinite pronouns in Hungarian may also take possessive suffixes (of all three persons), but because of the non-anaphoric nature of the resulting pronominal forms, they still seem to pattern as indefinites. Sentence b.1 shows such an indefinite form as an object of a verb in the indefinite conjugation, while sentences c.1, d.1, e.1, and f.1 show forms of the same kind in the "indefinite" frame *van/nincs* __X__ 'there is/is not __X__,' where *X* can only be an indefinite noun phrase which usually has zero as its determiner in Hungarian, regardless of whether the noun in question is a mass-noun or not. The English equivalent, of course, generally has the indefinite article before singular count-nouns and zero before non-count nouns and also before count-nouns in the plural whenever the Hungarian verbs or nouns are marked for plural in some way. In the examples that follow it can be seen from the approximate equivalents given for each Hungarian indefinite form that there is no one good formal way in English of consistently indicating a "possessive" here as there was in the case of the possessive quantitative pronouns, most of which have a possible English equivalent in an *of*-plus-noun-phrase construction. The following list of examples represents some of the indefinite pronouns in Hungarian which may occur as possessives:[3]

a. 1. Mi bajod van fiam, *mid* fáj? (*mi*? 'what?')
   2. What's your trouble, son? *What* hurts ((on) *you*)?

b. 1. Már láttál *valakid*(*et*) megérkezni? (*valaki* 'someone')
   2. Did you see *anyone* (of *your* people) arrive yet?

c. 1. Van ebben a városban *valakid*?
   2. Do *you* have *anyone* (close) in this town?

d. 1. Nincs *senkije*. (*senki* 'nobody/no one')
   2. *He* does*n*'*t* have *anyone*. (or: *He* has *no one*.)

e. 1. Nincs *semmim*. (or: *Semmim* sincs.) (*semmi* 'nothing')
   2. *I* have *nothing*. (or: *I* do*n*'*t* have *anything*.)

f. 1. Nekünk van mindenünk. (minden 'everything')
   2. We have everything.

g. 1. Fáj valamid? (valami 'something')
   2. Does something hurt ((on) you)?

In spite of the possessive suffixes, then, the above indefinite pronouns in Hungarian still behave as indefinites in a frame in which only indefinites can occur, or as indefinite interrogative pronouns with no previously-mentioned or situationally understood referent in mind.

11.5 Summary of definiteness of possessives

Although possessive noun phrases admittedly tend to be definite by their very nature, there are, nevertheless, numerous instances in which the possessive represents only part of its underlying referent. In such a case, the possessive construction patterns as a partial-definite, that is, with possible restrictive clauses in English, and with the possibility of governing the use of the indefinite conjugation in Hungarian. Pronouns with possessive suffixes in Hungarian, on the other hand, vary as to status of definiteness with total vs. partial reference, the person of the object, as well as the person of the subject (in some instances) all adding to the complexity of the picture. Generally speaking, however, pronouns with possessive suffixes--like their non-possessive noun phrase counterparts--tend to pattern as definite if they are total in reference, as partial-definite if only partial, or as indefinites if they have no particular referent.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

1. Because of the enormous range of uses to which they are put, there will be no attempt made here to give an all-embracing definition, that is, "dictionary definition," of "possessive constructions" or "possessives." In both English and Hungarian the criteria will be structural, i.e., both syntactic and morphological. *John's hat*, for example, is a *possessive construction* in English, as well as *my friend* and *a friend of mine*. The Hungarian equivalents of *hat* as used here, and *friend*, *kalapja* and *barátom*, respectively, are marked by endings called "(personal) possessive suffixes," while their "possessor" nouns are often unmarked: *János kalapja* or *Jánosnak a kalapja*. Noun phrases in Hungarian which have these possessive endings on the second member will be called *possessive constructions* here, regardless of the many types of semantic interpretation they may be subjected to. Similarly, that noun in English which appears in the frame *X's foot* or *the foot of X* will be called here the *possessor*, for the sake of convenience. The analogous frame in Hungarian is *X lába* or *X-nek a lába*. The other noun in the possessive construction will be labelled simply the *possessed*, and no attempt will be made to define these concepts further.

2. The interested reader may compare several recent, competing morphological analyses of the possessive noun in Hungarian by reading Antal (1964) and the works cited there.

3. Examples a. and g. are from Bánhidi *et al.* (1965:186), while d., e., and f. are from the same work, *p. 178*.

CHAPTER XII

NOUN CLAUSES

12.0 Introduction

As quoted in the Introduction to this work, a noun clause used as a direct object is considered definite in Hungarian and requires the use of the endings of the definite conjugation on the verb concerned. The English counterpart, although universally considered to be a type of noun phrase, even in traditional writings, generally speaking, has not been discussed specifically in terms of its definiteness. However, in some recent transformational-generative writings, analyses of English noun phrase complement constructions may be found in which--although it is not overtly stated--it appears that nominal clauses in English may pattern as definites in the same fashion as non-clausal noun phrases do, i.e., they may occur simultaneously with their identifying contexts. Variations in word order and positional restrictions on various elements in such "complex" sentences considerably complicate the picture in each of the two languages being studied here, a fact which makes an extensive analysis of all possible types of nominal clauses in English and Hungarian well beyond the scope of the present study. Accordingly, we shall again select only those cases of nominal clause usage which we feel are the most pertinent to the principal subject matter under investigation here, namely, the category of definiteness.

12.1 Clause as subject of the main verb

It seems simplest to illustrate the use of nominal clauses as definites by studying sentences in which the clauses are used as overt or "real" subjects or direct objects of the main verb of the given sentence. The clauses in question could then be tested for definiteness, so far as possible, in the same manner as other noun phrases were tested in this study. We shall deal with subject uses in this section, beginning with English, and then devote the next section to an examination of the objective uses of clauses in the two languages being contrasted here.

12.1.1 Noun clauses as subjects in English. There are numerous well-studied examples in which noun clauses occur as subjects in English, but the status of definiteness of these clauses in such a position is almost never mentioned.[1] We will examine several typical examples of such clause usage to see what sort of rules relating to the definiteness of the clauses might be formulated. When we observe the following sentences, for example, we see that it is difficult to test for definiteness unless we manipulate equivalent patterns. However, I believe it is possible to classify the clauses in a.1 and a.2 as definite when such manipulation is completed:

a. 1. That he is here is surprising.
   2. That John did this is incredible.

These sentences seem to be equivalent to the following:

b. 1. It is surprising that he is here.
   2. It is incredible that John did this.

but not
to: c. 1. *It that he is here is surprising.
   2. *It that John did this is incredible.

although the following semantically equivalent variants certainly are possible:

d. 1. The fact that he is here is surprising.
   2. The fact (idea?) that John did this is incredible.

The sentences in d. show a type of construction which is remarkably like that found in those definite constructions which occur with their identifying "previous mentions"--either from an independent utterance (e.1) or as a repetition or paraphrase of the introductory context (e.2)--embedded in the same sentence:

e. 1. The story that I'm going to tell is true.
   2. The man that I saw yesterday was strange.

It can be seen, first of all, that the pattern shown in the nonexistent sentences in c. ("intermediate sentoids"), "*It that ..." requires the deletion of it when this pronoun immediately precedes the clause complement, but not when it is associated with the main verb as an "empty subject," as in b., for example. On the other hand, the definite noun phrase the fact does occur in this position, its deletion being optional, as seen in d. Indeed, upon examining several more possible variants of the same patterns, we must conclude that it, as used here, and the fact are in complementary distribution on the sentence level:

f. 1. The fact that he is here is surprising.
   2. *It that he is here is surprising.

g. 1. *The fact is surprising that he is here.
   2. It is surprising that he is here.

h. 1. I am surprised by the fact that he is here.
   2. *I am surprised by it that he is here.
also: 3. I am surprised (that) he is here.

i. 1. Is the fact that he is here surprising?
   2. *Is it that he is here surprising?

j. 1. ?Is the fact surprising that he is here?
   2. Is it surprising that he is here?

It seems reasonable to assert that both it and the fact are on the same level of definiteness, and that together they form a construction that is as definite as the story in "The story that

I'm going to tell ..." Although it is obvious that the form that as a relative pronoun in the story that ... has a different clausal function than the "complementizer" that in the fact that ..., there seems to be sufficient motivation here for treating the latter as an "introducer" of a definite nominal, a type of apposition to a definite noun phrase, and the former as the introducer of a definitizing relative clause. If there is a scale of definiteness present here--and the facts are not at all clear--it certainly is not indicated by the use of an (underlying) it, as opposed to the fact, as it has been maintained. Perhaps the most important factor in all of this--although it is hard to formalize--is the fact that the grammatical sentences contained in f. through g. are hardly capable of being used to introduce a discourse. They all need some sort of previous mention or situational identification to make them fully appropriate, even though the referent involved is not always directly identifiable as a given noun phrase. One might say that the fact and it in complementary environments serve to summarize the previously-mentioned material or the real-world events of the discourse situation in one (definite) noun phrase which may be deleted in favor of its equally definite phrase complement.

12.1.2 Noun clauses as subjects in Hungarian. When one examines the Hungarian equivalents of the English sentences given in a. and b. of the preceding paragraph, it becomes immediately apparent that the acceptable Hungarian pattern actually corresponds more closely to the pattern shown in c. above:

a. 1. Az, hogy itt van, meglepő.[2]
2. Lit.: 'It that he is here (is) surprising.'

b. 1. Az, hogy János tette meg, hihetetlen.
2. Lit.: 'It that John did it (is) incredible.'

also: c. 1. Meglepő az, hogy itt van.
2. Lit.: 'Surprising (is) it that he is here.'

d. 1. Hihetetlen az, hogy János tette meg.
2. Lit.: 'Incredible (is) it that John did it.'

It seems the same arguments which were used to justify classifying English subject noun phrases as definite may be used to give the same classification to the equivalent constructions in Hungarian. We have a situation in which, generally speaking, a previously-given statement is summarized by a single unifying form. This summarizing form is az in Hungarian and may be considered definite as a type of total-anaphoric pronoun even though its referent may not be a particular noun phrase in prior discourse. It may be noted here that in Hungarian the use of az before the subject noun clause is just as obligatory as the deletion of it in English in comparable sentences. When it is a matter of object clauses, on the other hand, there are other interlingual contrasts, as well as intralingual variations to describe.

12.2 Noun clauses as objects

In either language noun clauses used as direct objects behave in a somewhat different way than the corresponding clauses when used as subjects. In English the function of it or the fact becomes a little more clear, while in Hungarian the general use of the definite conjugational endings on the main verb in such instances indicates the total-definite nature of object noun clauses. I believe we may profitably examine object clauses in the two languages more or less simultaneously, and will accordingly divide the discussion this time on the basis of the type of main verb used in the given sentence, since this affords a better opportunity to discuss certain peculiarities of some Hungarian patterns and also some variations in the equivalents in English.

12.2.1 Noun clauses as objects of verbs denoting a mental state. In this section the label "verb denoting a mental state" will be used as a cover term to designate those hard-to-characterize verbs such as know, believe, think, maintain, etc., which may be used to indicate some sort of apprehension of, or attitude toward real-world events on the part of the subject, the real-world events being symbolized by a noun phrase and/or noun clause complement. Using the same noun clauses as we did previously, we can observe several patterns in either language. For example, some verbs (of apprehension?) in English require the deletion of it or the fact, while, at the same time, that is optional:

a. 1. I know (that) he is here.
   2. Tudom, hogy itt van.

b. 1. I think (that) John did it.
   2. Azt hiszem, hogy János tette meg.

while other verbs (of attitude?) require the use of both the summarizing pronoun and the connective that:

c. 1. I don't like it that he is here.
   2. Nem szeretem azt, hogy itt van.

As can be seen from the examples below, inserting the elements associated with a verb from one category into a sentence containing a verb from the other category results in an ungrammatical pattern in English:

d. 1. *I know _it_ that he is here.
   2. *I don't like (that) he is here.

while in Hungarian the patterns overlap, as the translations of the sentences in d. indicate:

e. 1. (_Azt_) tudom, hogy itt van.
   2. (_Azt_) nem szeretem, hogy itt van.

On the other hand, the deletion of the previously-mentioned noun clause itself is possible with either sub-type of verb, in which case _it_ may be optionally used with the first sub-type while still being obligatory with the second:

f. 1.	(Speaker A:) He is here.	Itt van.
2.	(B:) I know (_it_).	(_Azt_) tudom.
g. 1.	(Speaker A:) He is here.	Itt van.
2.	(B:) Yes, but I don't like _it_.	Igen, de azt én nem szeretem.

Further differences in the syntactic behavior of these two sub-types of verbs in English are exhibited by the possibility of nominalizing the object clause:

	h. 1.	I don't like his being here.	Nem szeretem a jelenlétét.
	2.	*I know his being here.	*Tudom a jelenlétét.
(but:	3.	I know of his being here.	Tudok a jelenlétéről.)

However, regardless of which sub-type of verb we are dealing with here, we must conclude that the clausal object of such a verb as defined in this section is definite, as evidenced, for example, by the use of the definite anaphoric pronoun _it_ as a substitute for the previously-mentioned noun clause in f.2 and g.2. The Hungarian equivalents, as indicated in the above translations, show a somewhat similar type of sub-categorization with the obvious difference that the definite endings on the main verb allow more deletion possibilities in Hungarian than is the case in English. Accordingly, _azt_ or _hogy_, or the entire object clause may be deleted, the definite verbal endings acting, so to speak, as the anaphoric substitute for the "understood" (i.e., previously-mentioned and deleted) elements. These various patterns in both languages as discussed here are definite, although it certainly would be a gross oversimplification if we were to let our discussion of noun clauses stand with just this narrow range of possibilities coming under discussion. Accordingly, we shall now examine another type of verb which occurs with nominal clauses as direct objects, and then conclude this chapter by suggesting further possibilities for monolingual and bilingual contrastive analysis in this broad syntactic area.

12.2.2 Clauses as objects of verbs of reporting. "Verbs of reporting" is the broad label we will give to that fairly restricted class of verbs such as say, tell, answer, assert, etc. which serve to introduce or restate speech events either directly or indirectly. It goes without saying that such a functional classification as this is quite arbitrary since there are borderline cases where differentiating a "mental state" verb from a "verb of reporting" is, strictly speaking, impossible in English, and since, as will be shown in the sentences beginning with f. below, almost any verb--transitive or intransitive--can be used in Hungarian in the latter function. However, the above classification does allow us to examine object noun clauses in another light and thereby gain further insight into the complexity of their usage in both English and Hungarian, particularly the latter. If we once again begin our investigation here by using the same object clauses as above for easier comparison, we may observe sentences such as the following:

a. 1. She said (that) he is here.
2. Azt mondta, (hogy) itt van.[3]
or 3. Mondta, hogy itt van.

b. 1. She said (that) John did it.
2. Azt mondta, (hogy) János követte el.
or 3. Mondta, hogy János követte el.

In indirect speech the "previous mention" is so to speak packaged into the noun clause, which may or may not be introduced by a conjunction, but which, nevertheless, is to be considered as definite as any previously-mentioned noun phrase in subsequent occurrences. Direct speech, of course, is more or less the exact rendering of the pertinent speech act of prior discourse, and, as such, should be considered a definitized noun phrase *par excellence*. Although it is very difficult to apply the same structural test for definiteness to both simple noun phrases and object clauses, noun clauses as direct or indirect speech do not deviate from the test of collocatability with restrictive relative clauses in English, and with certain verbs in Hungarian. The patterning with the definite conjugation indicates the definiteness of such noun clauses, although as already mentioned, the variety of verb types used to introduce speech in Hungarian complicates the picture somewhat. The following sentences show verbs which always require the endings of the definite conjugation when their object is a noun clause (c., d., and e.):

c. 1. --János itt van--*gondolja* *magában* Kató.
2. "John is here," *thinks* Kate *to* *herself*.

d. 1. --Itt van János--*mondja* Pista.
2. "Here's John," *says* Steve.

e. 1. --Itt van János?--*kérdezi* Pista.
2. "Is John here?" *asks* Steve..

These may be compared to the following sentences which show not only obvious "verbs of reporting" but other transitive verbs as well, and even intransitive verbs of motion. Intransitive verbs, of course, normally occur with endings of the indefinite conjugation, while the transitive verbs may vary as to conjugational endings, depending on the type of actual object they govern. Note n.1, for example, where kinál has a definite (possessive) noun as its object and therefore has the definite ending, while at the same time other verbs, such as lép elő 'step forward' (l.1) and fordul -hoz 'turn to(ward)' (h.1) are intransitive verbs of motion. As can be seen, such combinations of direct speech and introductory verbs must in some instances be translated into English by quite devious means:

f. 1. --Ki ért a geometriához?--szól Kató barátnőihez.[4]
   2. "Who understands geometry?" speaks Kate to her
      girl friends. (i.e., 'asks Kate of ...')

g. 1. --Pedig milyen egyszerű!--nevet Kató.
   2. "But how simple!" laughs Kate.

h. 1. --Nincs nálad fénykép róluk?--fordul Helgához
      Kató.
   2. "Don't you have a picture of them with you?"
      turns Kate to Helga. (i.e., 'asks Kate turning
      to Helga.')

i. 1. --Nagy Sándor vagyok--mutatkozik be a fiú.
   "I'm Alex Nagy," introduces himself the boy.
   (i.e., 'says the boy introducing himself.')

j. 1. --Kis Erzsébet--válaszol a leány.
   2. "Elizabeth Kis," answers the girl.

k. 1. --Hol van a ceruzám? Nincs a zsebemben!--kiált
      fel István.
   2. "Where is my pencil? It's not in my pocket!"
      shouts (out) Steve.

l. 1. --Engem nem tetszik beírni, néni?--lép elő
      félénken Laci.
   2. "Wouldn't you like to register me, ma'am?"
      steps forward shyly Laci. (i.e., 'says Laci
      as he steps forward
      shyly.')

m. 1. --Az az ablak ott az én szobámé--mutat rá Dénes az egyik ablakra.
2. "That window there is to my room," points Dennis to one of the windows. (i.e., 'says Dennis pointing to one of the windows.')

n. 1. --Tessék venni egy kis süteményt!--kínálja Anna vendégeit.
2. "Please take some pastry," proffers Anne her guests. (i.e., 'says Anne offering her guests some pastry.')

Only the verb kínálja in n.1 has a definite ending, although válaszol 'answer, reply' in j.1 could also appear with such an ending in such a context, sometimes with no perceptible difference in meaning. The verb kínál, it must be noted, requires that the nouns designating the persons receiving the proffered articles appear in the accusative while the nouns designating the articles themselves generally appear with the instrumental -val suffix. Similar in behavior to válaszol is the verb felel, which may occur with either the definite or indefinite ending after a direct quotation:

o. 1. --Köszönöm, teát már nem kérek--felel Erzsébet.
2. --Köszönöm, teát már nem kérek--(ezt) feleli Erzsébet.

Although one native informant questioned did not find any difference in essential meaning between the two Hungarian sentences immediately above, another informant did feel that there is a distinction to be made here, even though it is not as clear in the above pair of contrasting sentences as it might be elsewhere. This distinction seems to be the usual one between totality and partiality. For the one native speaker, at least, when a direct quotation is followed by the indefinite form of either the verb válaszol or felel, there seems to be disunity between the noun clause and the rest of the sentence, as if they were two separate sentences in a narrative containing more speech material. The use of the definite conjugation, on the other hand, implies that the quotation is the total object of the verb in question. This distinction is much clearer when the verb felel is used in the restricted sense 'to answer/recite in class.' With the use of the indefinite conjugation it is implied that the quoted material is only a part of the total recitation, while with the use of the definite conjugational ending it is at least implied that the quotation represents the sum total of the recitation. With the fact in mind that there seems to be a disunity between direct quotations and a "verb of reporting" such as felel when used with an indefinite ending, it becomes more evident why such varied verbs as those given above could be used so readily to connect a direct quotation to the rest of the narrative in informal written styles. As a matter of fact, when one examines the short narratives from which the sample sentences were taken, one is struck by the fact that there is often no verb at all used to indicate change of speaker in cases where the context of the discourse itself is clear enough to indicate who the speaker is. One can infer from this that the primary function of the verb used in connection with a direct quotation is merely to indicate unambiguously who the speaker of the moment is, whenever the total vs. partial contrast is not felt to be important. It goes without saying that greater vividness and other stylistic results can be attained by the use of a variety of verbs with direct quotations, but this might be considered a secondary factor to the primary one of unambiguity in the speech act which is achieved by the use of the names of the given speakers as subjects of the various verbs acting as "verbs of reporting."

Needless to say, the above list of verbs used with direct quotations represents just a small sampling from one type of writing simplified for pedagogical purposes, and could be easily extended to monograph proportions. However, I believe these representative examples are sufficient to make clear the point that position alone does not serve as a proper indication of verb type in Hungarian, a fact which has a direct bearing on choice of verbal conjugation, even in instances--such as the above--where the given noun clauses must be considered equally definite, regardless of the verb type used in any one instance.

12.3 Other varieties of clause objects

Both from the descriptive-linguistic as well as the pedagogic-contrastive point of view the above discussion of noun clauses used as objects in English and Hungarian represents only a small beginning of a full analysis of the entire syntactic range of such noun clauses. Because of the limited goals set for this study, however, we must allow this matter to stand on the point just made in regard to the differentiation between partitive vs. total object, which in the case of clause objects can also be achieved by the use of the indefinite, as opposed to the definite conjugation. We may, however, suggest certain areas for further study by drawing on two short studies, one on the "factitive" verbs in Hungarian, the other on "desentential complement verbs" in English,[5] which deal with some of the syntactic possibilities of clause objects which must be explored before a fuller understanding of the definiteness of noun clauses is attained. We shall begin our discussion here with a short examination of the pertinent constructions in English.

12.3.1 Desentential complement verbs in English. In his article on verbs which take desentential complements in English, Fillmore lists on page 104 at least 76 verbs of the kind that we have broadly labelled "verbs of reporting" and "verbs denoting a mental state." These verbs all take a nominal clause introduced by that (which is optional in most cases), but, as can be seen from the verb first listed, admit, there is a great deal of overlapping since some verbs may take several other types of complements besides that clauses. The verb admit, for example, also takes an -ing phrase nominalization, a fact which allows the opportunity for a fuller cross-classification of various verbs according to their total possibilities for patterning with clause or phrasal complements. It might prove interesting, for example, to test whether such an attempt at a detailed classification has any usefulness in studying the status of definiteness of the various objects. In other words, would it be profitable to classify verbs like admit, for example, as "THAT-and-ING verbs" (or, based on Fillmore's numbering, "1.5 verbs"), or want as a "TO-and-telescoped future-and-telescoped copular-and-NOT-shift (or a 5.8.11.[illegible] verb?" For example, are the direct objects of admitted in these semantically equivalent (?) sentences both definite?:

a. 1. He admitted that he robbed a bank.
   2. He admitted robbing a bank.

Perhaps one can say impressionistically that the gerund phrase of a.2 is somehow "more definite" than the noun clause of a.1 since the "recognizably definite" determiner his may be inserted before that latter. However, there is no real structural reason for doing so, since these two direct objects otherwise behave the same way as far as definite status is concerned. Both of these objects are ultimately derivable from the same sort of previously-mentioned utterance, regardless of the surface form one chooses for the subsequent reference. Could the same reasoning hold also for "objects" of verbs with other types of government, for example, verbs which take various prepositions before such a gerund phrase as that given above?:

b. 1. One should *abstain* *from* robbing a bank on Sunday.
2. One should *refrain* *from* robbing a bank on Sunday.
3. I don't *approve* *of* robbing a bank on Sunday.
4. He wanted to *arrange* *for* robbing a bank on Sunday.
5. His greatest pleasure *consists* *in/of* robbing a bank on Sunday.
6. He *delights* *in* robbing a bank on Sunday.
7. He always *counts* *on* robbing a bank on Sunday.

Is "robbing a bank on Sunday" then a definite nominal in the above sentences? Does the fact that its connection with a previously-mentioned noun phrase of some sort is less clear here than it would be after a "verb of reporting" such as *admit*, *deny*, etc. or after a "verb denoting a mental state" such as *dislike*, *dread*, *regret*, *remember*, *resent*, etc., have any effect on its definiteness? These questions are difficult to answer from the structural point of view since the test of compatibility with relative clauses is quite limited in such cases. Only a summarizing clause introduced by *which* seems to occur after such a nominal. However, since this clause is a non-restrictive clause, one must tentatively give the label "definite" to such nominals until a more thorough investigation of these matters is undertaken. Hungarian has similarly ambiguous constructions in which the apparent definiteness of the given "object" is not always indicated by a conjugational ending since the syntactic relationship involved is often not one of verb-to-direct-object, but rather verb-to-a-non-accusative-noun. The contrastive patterning possibilities in English and Hungarian are especially multitudinous when there are two objects involved, as we shall see more fully in the next section. Here, however, we might for contrastive purposes mention several well-known features of some English verbal complements which have a seemingly closer bearing on considerations of definiteness. There are verbs in English, for example, which take an infinitive complement whether there is a change of subject involved or not:

c. 1. I want to go. — I want him to go.
2. I prefer to go. — I prefer him to go.

Other verbs, on the other hand, require different patterns when another subject is involved:

d. 1. I don't care to go. — I don't care for him to go.
2. I intend to go. — I intend for him to go.
3. I decided to go. — I decided that he should go.
4. I am arranging to go. — I am arranging for him to go.
5. I mean to go. — I mean for him to go.

Some verbs, of course, may have two (or more) possible patterns:

e. 1. I expect to go. — I expect him to go.
I expect that he will go.
2. I wish to go. — I wish him to go.
I wish that he would go.

Cross-classifying verbs, then, as to category (or categories) of phrasal or clausal complements they may take and also as to what mood the verb appears in within the clause would yield enough different pattern types to serve as the basis of a full-length study of much greater proportions than the present study, which treats of a greater range of syntactic patterns entering into a discussion of the category of definiteness. Nevertheless, whether attempting such a classification of verbs for the purpose of determining the status of definiteness of the given nominals may prove useful or not is an open question. The same holds for the comparable situation in Hungarian, as a glance at "factitive" verbs will show.

12.3.2 Factitive verbs in Hungarian. "Factitive verbs" will be the label given those verbs in Hungarian (without the causative suffix) which denote the initiation of an activity or action through or by means of someone or something else. In its broadest sense, this term could include such verbs as akar 'want' when there is a "change of subject" involved:

a. 1. El akarok menni.   (Azt) akarom, hogy elmennjen.
   2. I want to go.   I want him to go. ('that he go')

The second pattern type is quite common in Hungarian, as "objective case as the subject of an infinitive" is generally not the rule where factitive verbs are involved. The second sentence in a.1 shows that a (definite) clause complement in which the second entity involved is the subject of the second verb (often in the imperative, but see further below) may be required to match the English infinitive construction. The indefinite ending on akar in the first sentence as opposed to the definite ending on the same verb in the second illustrates the fact that a clause used as a total direct object is definite, while an infinitive as sole object is actually neuter with respect to definiteness. Thus, while akar in the first sentence above has an indefinite ending because of the (intransitive, i.e. "objectless") infinitive menni 'to go,' it may occur in the definite if the dependent infinitive in turn has a definite object:

b. 1. Ezt a könyvet meg akarom nézni.
   2. I want to take a look at this book.

Here we might classify "ezt a könyver megnézni" of b.1 as definite as the clause "hogy elmenjen" of a.1. On the other hand, there are verbs in English which may take an infinitive complement in a fashion parallel to want with no change of subject, but which have equivalents in Hungarian of another pattern. This requires the use of a clause complement, even when there is not a change of subject involved. Such a clause, as a total (direct) object governs the use of the definite conjugation:

c. 1. He decided to travel to Europe next year.
   2. Elhatározta, hogy jövőre Európába utazik.

Such a verb, of course, would require no change in pattern when changed to a factitive verb by the inclusion of another person:

d. 1. He decided that you should go.
   2. Elhatárazta, hogy te utazzál el.

Needless to say, there are other types of government possible for Hungarian factitive verbs, and if one attempts to pair the possible English patterns with likely "equivalents" in Hungarian, the combinations are indeed numerous. Here we can indicate only some of the patterns occurring in Hungarian.

12.3.2.1 Pattern types with noun clauses. Earlier in this chapter we discussed several simple, clear-cut examples of noun clauses used as definite objects in Hungarian. In the case of the one-object verbs considered then, it was often a simple matter to ascertain the status of definiteness of the noun clause object. In the case of factitive verbs with clause objects, on the other hand, it is often difficult to ascertain the definiteness of the second object in many pattern types since the type of conjugational ending on the verb depends on the definiteness of the actual direct object in each particular sentence. The English equivalent, of course, often provides few or no clues as to the identity of the "actual" direct object in the given Hungarian sentence. Each Hungarian sentence must be viewed individually to determine the type of government required by the given verb. For example, some Hungarian factitive verbs require the use of the "anticipatory" pronoun *az* before clauses introduced by *hogy*, as in a.1, while with other verbs it may be optional, as in b.1. However, the government of the verb may be such that this pronoun may occur in other case forms besides the accusative. In such a case, of course, the main verb is definite only if the first object is definite, as in a. and b., where the anticipatory pronouns are in the ablative and sublative cases, respectively:

a. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget *attól*, hogy dohányozzék.[6]
 2. The doctor forbade the patient to smoke. (lit.: 'forbade (def.) the patient (acc.) from *it* (abl.), that he smoke.')

b. 1. Péter (*arra*) biztatta a legényeket, hogy tiltakozzanak.
 2. Peter encouraged the young men to protest. ('encouraged (def.) the young men (acc.) to *it* (subl.), that they protest')

Other verbs take first objects either in the dative (c.1), or ablative (d.1), or sublative (e.1). In these cases the demonstrative pronoun is optional, but, when present, it has the accusative ending, thereby governing the use of the definite conjugation in turn:

c. 1. Az agronómus (*azt*) tanácsolta az embereknek, hogy dolgozzanak még jobban.
 2. The agronomist advised the people to do even better work. ('advised (*it*) (def.) (acc.) to the people (dat.), that they work still better.')

d. 1. A házigazda (*azt*) követelte a lakótól, hogy fizesse ki a lakbért.
 2. The landlord demanded that the tenant pay up the rent. ('demanded (*it*) (def.) (acc.) of the tenant (abl.), that he pay (def.) up the rent.')

e. 1. A szövetkezet (*azt*) bízta rá Nagyra, hogy vegye
meg a traktort.
2. The co-operative commissioned Nagy to buy the
tractor. ('entrusted (def.) (acc.) (*it*) to
Nagy (subl.), that he buy (def.) the tractor.')

12.3.2.2 *Other pattern types.* The four sentences just given show a noun clause as part of a "basic" pattern in Hungarian factitive verb constructions. In addition to the fact that the noun clause itself is derivable from a sentence embedded into the main sentence, there are other patterns which may be derived from a similar source. These include infinitive constructions and deverbal nominalizations which may be used as alternates for the pattern with a clause "object," if, indeed, we are dealing with an object in all instances. We shall list several examples of the various patterns which do occur. For comparative purposes we shall give first the clause pattern (with the clausal verb in the imperative), then the alternate patterns, beginning with factitive verbs requiring the object in the accusative:

a. 1. Az apa elküldte a fiút, hogy vadásszon.
2. The father sent the boy out to hunt.
('sent out (def.) the boy (acc.), that he hunt.')

b. 1. Az apa elküldte a fiút vadászni.
2. The father sent the boy out to hunt. (infinitive)

c. 1. Az apa elküldte a fiút a vadászatra.
2. The father sent the boy out hunting. ('sent out
(def.) the boy (acc.) to the hunt (subl.)')

Other verbs have their first objects in the dative:

d. 1. A katona segített a fogolynak, hogy meneküljön.
2. The soldier helped the prisoner (to) escape.
('helped (indef.) the prisoner (dat.), that
he escape')

e. 1. A katona segített a fogolynak menekülni.
2. The soldier helped the prisoner to escape.
(infinitive)

f. 1. A katona segített a fogolynak a menekülésben.
2. The soldier helped the prisoner in the escape.
('... in the escaping (inessive)')

Both segített and meneküljön in the above examples are in the indefinite form because of the dative (rather than accusative) government of the former and the intransitiveness of the latter. Can one then speak at all of the "definiteness" of the clauses introduced by hogy in a.1 and d.1? Are these actually noun clauses, or are they adverbial clauses of purpose indicating something to the effect: 'in order that he might hunt/escape' or 'in order for him to hunt/escape'? These and similar questions multiply when one realizes that the various combinations of clause pattern, case forms, and infinitive patterns all add up to a considerable variety, all of which cannot be listed here.[7] Even deverbal nominalizations themselves may be quite varied, with at least eight case forms possible with factitive verbs. One example is particularly interesting and worthy of citation here. For the sake of convenience to the reader, we shall repeat the related sentence with a clause pattern which we have given previously (12.3.2.1, a.1):

g. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget attól, hogy dohányozzék.
2. The doctor forbade the patient to smoke.

also: h. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a dohányzást a betegtől.[8]
2. ('forbade (def.) the smoking (acc.) from the patient (abl.)')

and: i. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget a dohányzástól.
2. ('forbade (def.) the patient (acc.) from the smoking (abl.)')

and: j. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a dohányzást a betegnek.
2. ('forbade (def.) the smoking (acc.) for the patient (dat.)')

Here the verb is in the definite form either because of the definiteness of the previously-mentioned noun phrase a beteg 'the patient' (g.1 and i.1) or because of the generic, hence definite, nature of a dohányzás 'smoking.' Could the latter reason be sufficient for labelling the hogy clause in g.1 "definite," in parallel fashion as its related nominalizations, which are marked for definiteness by the definite article, in the other sentences? Properly answering such questions requires further investigation well beyond the scope of this study. It is hoped, however, that the survey given in the last section of this chapter, as brief as it is, may serve to indicate where some of the possibilities for further research lie in a full investigation of the matter of definiteness, not only as it relates to noun phrases, but to other syntagmas as well.[9]

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

1. An exception is Katz and Postal (1964), where it is remarked in footnote 55 that there may be a "less definite" *it*, rather than *the fact* underlying such subject noun clauses.

2. There is a pattern in Hungarian which corresponds very closely to the English *the fact that* ... construction: "*A tény, hogy* a város elesett ..." 'the fact that the city fell ...' (Hall 1944:71). However, this pattern is so subordinate in usage to the pattern with *az, hogy*, that we may ignore it here.

3. It can be noted from a.2 and a.3, and also from b.2 and b.3 that either *azt* or *hogy* may be deleted from such a sentence, but never both.

4. This and the remaining Hungarian sentences in 12.2.2 are taken from Bánhidi as follows: f.1 from p. 154, g.1 from p. 155, h.1 from p. 154, i.1 from p. 141, j.1 from p. 141, l.1 from p. 186, m.1 from p. 198, n.1 from p. 154, and o.1 and o.2 from p. 159.

5. See Szabó (1967) and Fillmore (1964). Rosenbaum (1967) treats in more detail the same structures as analyzed in Fillmore's paper.

6. The Hungarian sentences in 12.3.2.1 and 12.3.2.2--with the exception of h.1, i.1, and j.1--are taken from Szabó (1967: 412 ff.).

7. See Szabó (1967) for an account of the actually occurring combinations.

8. This and the following two examples are based on patterns found in Zsilka (1967:52).

9. For example, we have not dealt with "definite relative adverbs" in English (see, e.g., Katz and Postal 1964:91 ff.). Nor have we been able to investigate the interconnections between definiteness, aspect, and word order in Hungarian, especially as these relate to the use of the verbal prefixes. Examples such as the following certainly bear investigating: "Nők is *mentek be*, gyerekek is." '(Some) women and children entered,' vs. "A nők *bementek*, a gyerkek is." '(Both) the women and the children entered.' A detailed study of these phenomena in Hungarian might be a full-length work in itself, especially if one were to compare such positional contrasts with those reported for other languages, e.g., Spanish: "la linda hija de Don Pedro" vs. "la hija linda de Don Pedro," (Stockwell *et al.* 1965:90) and English: "for noun phrases with specified determiners indefiniteness is associated with postnominal position and definiteness with prenominal position" (Smith 1964:41).

PART THREE

MORPHO-SYNTAX

INTRODUCTION TO PART THREE

Up to this point in our study we have not dealt with morphology as such, even though it is a popularly-known fact that Hungarian is an "agglutinating" language, i.e., possesses a great variety of suffixes to express grammatical relations the equivalents of which are expressed in English and other "analytic" languages by the use of whole words. It is my opinion that the extensive suffixation of Hungarian becomes immediately apparent to any beginning student of the language and, as such, hardly needs to be mentioned, particularly in a contrastive grammar. Nevertheless, in the actual use of these inflected forms, the English-speaking student encounters difficulty because suffixation (and accentuation) in Hungarian are almost inextricably woven together with matters of syntax which have to be mastered before full effectiveness is attained in handling the language being learned. The area of grammar dealing with the interrelatedness of morphology and syntax may be called morpho-syntax, and for the purpose of easier explication will be segmented somewhat arbitrarily here into the divisions indicated in the chapter headings of Part Three. Again, since a "complete" grammar is out of the question here, areas for discussion had to be greatly restricted in number. The reader will undoubtedly be able to think of other areas of morpho-syntax in the grammars of English and Hungarian which would make interesting topics of contrastive analysis. Starting, however, with the area of Hungarian syntax which is undoubtedly the most difficult for English speakers to master, namely word order, I believe that the following analyses may prove useful.

CHAPTER XIII

SENTENCE WORD ORDER

13.0 Introduction

Up to this point in our study we have said nothing about the obvious fact that Hungarian is a highly inflected language, an "agglutinating language" in older terms, while English has relatively little inflection, that is, is an "analytic language." There is good reason for this. The fact that certain syntactic relationships usually expressed by "function words" such as prepositions, and by word order, or stress and word order in English are generally expressed by stress and suffixication in Hungarian is immediately apparent to anyone attempting to formulate or analyze even the most basic Hungarian sentence consisting of two or more elements. Interference resulting from such divergent linguistic typologies is not directly due to the agglutinating nature per se of Hungarian versus the synthetic nature of English, since, for example, there is no alternative but to translate the English phrase "in the house" by a corresponding noun in Hungarian inflected for the inessive case, generally "a házban." The difficulty is an indirect result of the highly inflected nature of Hungarian, which permits more flexibility in word order than is possible in a less inflected language. With the syntactic relationships being fairly clearly expressed by suffixation, Hungarian, like Latin, can have "free" word order within a given sentence. However, again as in Latin, the word order in Hungarian is not haphazard. It is, rather, "free" to the extent that various syntactic elements may occur in various positions with a given sentence, but with certain constraints, and with some sort of semantic difference, even if only of emphasis, obtaining in the contrasting structures. While the interrelationships of emphasis, stress, juncture, and word order in either language are not yet fully understood, there are generalizations which may be made which may prove useful for English-speaking students studying Hungarian.

13.1 Basic order

To initiate our discussion of word order in Hungarian we will begin with an examination of simple, declarative sentences and derive more complex structures from these. The simplest procedure, in theory, at least, would presumably involve taking a "neutral" sentence as the starting-point. However, it is doubtful that such exists, since prior discourse often dictates what the focus, the emphasized element, of a given sentence is to be. The prime example of this, of course, is the question-answer dialog in which the interlocutor provides the "topic" in an interrogative sentence, and the respondent the "comment" about this topic in a declarative sentence. Although in actual conversation elliptical structures are often used, we shall start our discussion with the full constructions and will attempt to give the "most neutral" order of elements as a point of departure.

13.1.1 Sentences with two elements. The term "element" is to be here understood as a syntactic segment capable of occurring in various relative positions within a sentence. Thus, neither the nor -s in the houses are considered to be movable syntactic elements in considerations of sentence word order, although the entire syntagma the houses is. We are considering here complete sentences with two elements in Hungarian. Therefore, it becomes necessary to remind the English-speaking student of Hungarian that even though an English sentence may have two elements, for example, a pronominal subject and a predicate, Hungarian, like Spanish and many other languages, may have both the subject and predicate expressed in the verb, which then may be called a "sentence word." In fact, we have shown in Chapter V, that Hungarian may go even further than Spanish in this regard in that it may also incorporate a pronominal object in the verbal ending: *tudom* 'I know (it).' Therefore, we are considering at this point those Hungarian sentences in which two syntactic elements are overtly present, namely, a minimum "topic" and a minimum "comment," a simple "theme" and a simple "proposition" concerning it. In a "most neutral" sentence in Hungarian the topic ordinarily precedes the comment, as in English:[1]

a. 1. Péter olvas.
   2. Peter is reading.

b. 1. A vonat megy.
   2. The train is going.

c. 1. Egy vonat megy.
   2. A train is going.

However, under conditions of stress other word-order possibilities occur in Hungarian which are not possible in English. These include the occurrence of the zero article with a count-noun, which regularly implies stress:

d. 1. *Vonat* megy.
   2. A *train* is going. (It's a *train* that's going.)

Emphasis, of course, can also be placed on the predicate (or virtually any element of it, as we shall see below), in which case the word order in Hungarian usually deviates from the English:

e. 1. *Megy* a/egy vonat.
   2. The/a train *is* (*indeed*) going.

f. 1. _Megy_ vonat.
2. A train _is_ going.

If the Hungarian sentence of two elements is an equational sentence, on the other hand, then the English equivalent will have three elements, and the permutational possibilities will differ from the above. (Note that there is no copula in the Hungarian.) Again beginning from the "most neutral" order, we can have:

g. 1. A ház magas.
2. The house is tall.

h. 1. Egy ház magas.
2. A house is tall.

but not: i. 1. *Ház magas.
2. 'House is tall.'

Under conditions of emphasis we may have:

j. 1. _Magas_ a/egy ház.
2. _The/a_ house is _tall_.

but not: k. 1. *_Magas_ ház.
2. '_Tall_ house.'

although, of course, the latter ungrammatical sentence is an acceptable sequence for a noun phrase.

We have used the expression "most neutral" above for good reason, for, as mentioned before, the favored position of stressed elements in Hungarian is immediately before the verb.[2] However, the stress placed on a subject in a two-element sentence may vary from "very slight" to "very strong" without a change of word order, the English equivalents employing pulmonary stress or different emphatic constructions:

l. 1. _Péter_ olvas.
2. _Peter_ is reading.
or: 3. It's _Peter_ who's reading.
or: 4. _Peter_ is the one who's reading.

In a sentence of three elements, on the other hand, there are possibilities of emphasizing the subject more strongly in non-initial position, since the permutational possibilities are increased threefold. In sentences with four elements the variants are increased to twenty-four theoretical possibilities, although some of the orders might be labelled marginal. It would serve little purpose to go beyond this number in our discussion here, since the number of dubious cases would be increased correspondingly.

13.1.2 Sentences with three or four elements. In discussing sentences with three or more elements we are still dealing with a simple topic, but there is more than one element in the comment. Each of the latter elements can be permuted independently in relation to the topic so that we can have six possible variants of sentences with three elements, and twenty-four of sentences with four syntactic elements. Again the use of the zero article places restrictions on some variants, while other variants are marginal in that they require broader contexts for fuller acceptability. To begin with a sentence of three elements, we may select either 1) a transititve verb with object, 2) an intransitive one with adverbial complement, or 3) a copula with a predicate adjective, predicate noun, or a locative. Each of these types has its syntactic peculiarities.

13.2 Sentences with transitive verbs

In viewing Hungarian sentences consisting of S(ubject), V(erb), and O(bject) it is not entirely clear whether SVO or SOV is the "preferred" basic order. For our purposes here we will begin our discussion with the basic sentence given in a. below:

a. 1. Péter olvassa a levelet.
   2. Peter is reading the letter.

While there is a very weak stress on *Peter* in a.1, much stronger stress can be attained in non-initial, preverbal position:

b. 1. A levelet *Péter* olvassa.
   2. *Peter* is the one who is reading the letter.

Absolute final position is not a possible stress position for S or O since the necessary preverbal position is thereby lost, the stress accordingly shifting to some other element in the sentence. Placing the emphasis on O results in the following two permutations, weaker stress occurring in c.1 than in d.1:

c. 1. Péter a *levelet* olvassa.
   2. Peter is reading the *letter*.

d. 1. A *levelet* olvassa Péter.
   2. It's the *letter* that Peter's reading.

Since the element immediately preceding the verb is the stressed element in a given sentence, it follows that the only position in which the verb itself can receive full stress is in initial position. There are, of course, two possible variants here:

e. 1. *Olvassa* Péter a levelet.
   2. Peter *is* reading the letter.

f. 1. *Olvassa* a levelet Péter.
   2. Peter is in the process of reading the letter.

Object noun phrases with Ø or *egy* are also possible here in all permutations, however, with a change of meaning in the case of emphasized O with zero. The English translation given below attempts to capture the generic nature of this semantic change:

g. 1. Péter *levelet* olvas.
   2. *Levelet* olvas Péter.
   3. Peter reads letters.
or: 4. Peter is a letter-reader.

13.2.1 *Sentences with intransitive verbs*. Sentences with three elements in which the V is intransitive have the same permutational possibilities as above except that at least two of the resulting variants are questionable (marked ?) below as they stand in isolation:

a. 1. A vonat megy gyorsan.
2. The train is going fast.

This sentence has then the following permutations:

b. 1. A vonat gyorsan megy.
2. Gyorsan megy a vonat.
3. Gyorsan a vonat megy.
4. ?Megy a vonat gyorsan.
5. ?Megy gyorsan a vonat.

As interrogative sentences the last two examples would be fully acceptable, but with the meaning "Can the train go fast?" i.e. "Is it a fast train?"

13.2.2 Sentences with copula. If the verb in a Hungarian three-element sentence is the copula van 'is,' then the number of acceptable permutations may decrease:

a. 1. Péter van otthon.
2. Peter is at home.

also: b. 1. Péter otthon van.
2. Otthon van Péter.
3. Otthon Péter van.
4. *Van Péter otthon.
5. *Van otthon Péter.

(These may be acceptable in the meaning "There is a (person named) Peter at home.")

However, if the verb is in the past, then acceptable variants of b.4 and b.5 result:

c. 1. Volt Péter otthon.
2. Volt otthon Péter.
3. Peter was at home. (i.e., Peter did come for a visit.)

If, on the other hand, the element following the verb is a predicate adjective, then the permutation with the verb in initial position is unacceptable regardless of the tense of the verb in question. Thus we have:

d. 1. A ház volt magas.
2. The house was tall.

and e. 1. A ház *magas* volt.
2. *Magas* volt a ház.
3. Magas *a* *ház* volt.
but not: 4. **Volt* a ház magas.
5. **Volt* magas a ház.

It must be noted here that while the copula in a Hungarian equational sentence such as the above is mandatorily deleted in the present tense (third person only), the past-tense form of the verb is required in the surface structure to convey the notion of tense, if for no other reason. It must be further noted that if the element following the copula is a predicate noun, then correct sentences again result from the placing of the copula in initial position, as was the case in c. above:

f. 1. *Volt* Péter katona.
2. *Volt* katona Péter.
3. Peter *was* a soldier.

However, it is not clear whether the grammaticality of c. and f. results from the tense of the verb and the nature of the predicate, respectively, or from the proper-noun status of the S.

One more aspect of equational sentences in Hungarian must be mentioned at this point, namely that indefinite noun phrases are also possible for S, with, however, differences in grammaticality. While the sentences with *egy* *ház* instead of *a* *ház*, as in e., would result in the very same type of unacceptable sentences, those with zero would be *all* ungrammatical. Thus, while we can have:

g. 1. Egy ház *magas* volt.
2. *Egy* *ház* volt magas.

and the like, we cannot have:

h. 1. *Ház magas volt.
or: 2. *Ház volt magas.

or any of the other four possibilities.

13.3 Sentences with four elements

Sentences with four elements may be treated basically in the same manner as sentences with three elements, except for the obvious fact that there are considerably more variants possible, both in permutations and degrees of stress. As the latter phenomena are not fully understood as yet, we will concentrate our attentions here on permutations resulting from primary stress placement which will be marked by underscoring. Starting with the "most neutral" sentence with a simple topic and a three-part comment in SVO order, we get:

a. 1. Péter olvassa a levelet gyorsan.
2. Péter olvassa gyorsan a levelet.
3. Péter a levelet gyorsan olvassa.
4. Péter a levelet olvassa gyorsan.
5. Péter gyorsan a levelet olvassa.
6. Péter gyorsan olvassa a levelet.

Peter is reading the letter rapidly, etc.

b. 1. A levelet olvassa gyorsan Péter.
2. A levelet olvassa Péter gyorsan.
3. A levelet Péter olvassa gyorsan.
4. A levelet Péter gyorsan olvassa.
5. A levelet gyorsan Péter olvassa.
6. A levelet gyorsan olvassa Péter.

c. 1. Olvassa Péter a levelet gyorsan.
2. Olvassa Péter gyorsan a levelet.
3. Olvassa a levelet Péter gyorsan.
4. Olvassa a levelet gyorsan Péter.
5. Olvassa gyorsan Péter a levelet.
6. Olvassa gyorsan a levelet Péter.

Peter is in the process of reading the letter rapidly.

d. 1. Gyorsan Péter olvassa a levelet.
2. Gyorsan Péter a levelet olvassa.
3. Gyorsan olvassa Péter a levelet.
4. Gyorsan olvassa a levelet Péter.
5. Gyorsan a levelet Péter olvassa.
6. Gyorsan a levelet olvassa Péter.

As can be seen from the above, every element in such a sentence may be fully stressed, the V, however, only in initial, the other elements in all positions except the last. Initial position indicates weak stress with S, but strong stress in the case of the other elements. The third position is also a place of strong stress, except, of course, for the verb. There can be deletions of the subject in such sentences as the above. However, the ensuing structures have, or, at least seem to have, the same type of possibilities for stress as the fuller sentences:

e. 1. A levelet olvassa gyorsan. He's reading the
2. A levelet gyorsan olvassa. letter fast. etc.

More could be said in regard to accent, especially "prosodic accent" in such sentences. However, the practicql gain for our purposes here would be slight.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

1. I owe a great deal to Dezső (1965) for much of the analysis and many of the examples used in the following sections.

2. In fact, "Fogarasi's Law" states that the word immediately preceding the verb in Hungarian is always stressed.

CHAPTER XIV

INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES

14.0 Introduction

Having discussed the order of elements in a simple, affirmative sentence in Hungarian, it is a relatively easy task to discuss the corresponding interrogative structures if one bears in mind the fact that for all practical purposes any element in a sentence may be stressed. In fact, it is easily understandable that the acceptable sentences in 13.1.3 could be the logical answers to a series of questions asking for specific information by the employment of interrogative words in the same position as the stressed elements in the declarative sentences. Moreover, like English, but to a much greater extent, Hungarian structure permits the formulation of questions by characteristic intonation alone, the linear arrangement of the elements being the same as that in the corresponding declarative sentence. We shall discuss the first-mentioned type of question first.

14.1 Questions with interrogative words

In contrasting the complete structures of interrogative sentences in English and Hungarian it is naturally necessary to take matters of intonation into consideration. However, inasmuch as all the intricacies of intonation are not yet fully understood for either language, and inasmuch as this study will not treat phonology as such, we can give only an impressionistic account of basic interrogative intonational patterns here. Suffice it to state that in both English and Hungarian the intonational pattern of declarative sentences and questions with interrogative words is virtually the same. It is primarily the placement of the stress that varies between the interrogative and the declarative structures. Since the stress patternings in the two languages may contrast sharply from each other, it is to these that we need to devote the greater part of our attention. Starting with non-emphatic questions we find that the interrogative words themselves normally bear the main sentence stress in both languages, since it is precisely on these words that the focus of the sentence lies. In a Hungarian sentence with two elements one would expect to find the question word in initial position immediately before the predicate:

a. 1. Ki olvas?
   2. Who is reading?

b. 1. Mi az?
   2. What is that?

However, inasmuch as the place of full stress is immediately before the finite verb in a Hungarian sentence, there are, in sentences containing more than two elements, other permutational possibilities permitted which still retain the full stress on the question word. Some examples are:

c. 1. Péter mit olvas?
   2. What is Peter reading?

d. 1. Most hol van Péter?
   2. Where is Peter?

e. 1. Péter hol van most?
   2. Where is Peter now?

beside: f. 1. Hol van most Péter?
   2. Where is Peter now?

g. 1. Hol van Péter most?   etc.
   2. Where is Peter now?

The stress on the elements preceding the question word may vary, of course, depending on the importance the speaker attaches to them in the given discourse. Stressing elements other than the subject involves placement in initial position for strongest emphasis, while for at least one native Hungarian speaker, final position is also a place of stress for adverbs, and even S, in sentences with question words. However, it is not clear whether this stress is anything more than secondary stress. Corresponding degrees of stress on the non-interrogative elements in the English equivalents may be expressed by vocal emphasis or position, the latter process often indicating the stronger degree:

h. 1. Most hol van Péter?
2. Where is Peter now?
3. Now where is Peter?

Depending on the emphasis desired, the stressed initial segment may be followed by open juncture:

i. 1. Most + hol van Péter?
2. Now + where is Peter?

However, beyond these few remarks, little can be said here on the interrelatedness of juncture, emphasis, intonation and position since these phenomena are very difficult to analyze in either of the two languages.

14.2 Yes-no questions

For the sake of our discussion we may conveniently divide yes-no questions into three types in each language: 1) those with inverted word order, 2) those with direct word order and rising intonation, and 3) those with direct word order and a tag word. These different categories show quite a few interlingual similarities, but several contrasts as well. Each category will be examined separately.

14.2.1 *Questions with inverted word order*. In addition to the markedly different intonational contours, yes-no questions in Hungarian differ from their English counterparts in respect to rules of inversion as well. While Hungarian grammar allows the inversion of the subject and of any verb construction acting as predicate in a given sentence, English allows only the inversion of the subject and the "full" verbs *be* and *have* (the latter only marginally, however) and the auxiliaries of "compound" verbs. Otherwise, the interrogative auxiliary *do* must be added and placed before the subject. Thus, we can have in modern English:

a. 1. *Is* John there?
2. *Have* you any cigarettes?
3. *Is* he going?
4. *Could* Pete do it?

and the like, but not (in current colloquial English) *Went he? *Drove she? or other inversions of single verb forms. The English-speaking student learning Hungarian must therefore convert his rising final interrogative tone to a rising-falling one (on the penultimate syllable) in addition to adjusting to the permutation possibilities of the various elements in the Hungarian yes-no question. While a sentence in Hungarian with two elements may readily be made interrogative by a simple inversion of subject and predicate, sentences of three or more elements may have the focus placed on any element in the sentence by stress placement and preverbal position while still retaining the yes-no intonational contour. Thus we may readily have:

b. 1. Olvas Péter?
2. Is Peter reading?

c. 1. Megy a vonat?
2. Is the train going?

but also: d. 1. *A levelet* olvassa Péter?
2. Is Peter reading the *letter*? (Is it the *letter* Peter's reading?)

and: e. 1. Most olvassa Péter a levelet?
2. Most olvassa a levelet Péter?
3. Is Peter reading the letter now?

In fact there is actually little point in speaking of "inverted word order" in Hungarian yes-no questions, since we can see that the above sentences are identical, except for intonation, to the declarative types given in the various sections of 13.1. Just as any tagmeme may be given full stress in a declarative sentence in Hungarian and given prominence by placement before the verb, so also may the same process be used in interrogation. The corresponding English structures will again vary, depending on the amount of stress on the preverbal element. This can be illustrated by several examples of simple sentences in SV or SVO order.

14.2.2 Questions with direct word order. While we have just indicated that from the Hungarian point of view there is no need to separate interrogative structures (or declarative) into those with direct order and all others, it may be pedagogically useful at this point to contrast question types with SV(O) order. In instances where there is no strong emphasis on any particular element, simple interrogative sentences in the two languages may match fairly well, although English seems to employ direct interrogative word order more often in instances of "echoing," in which surprise, anger, etc. are reflected in the higher pitch level of the repeated utterance. We do have, however, quite neutral questions such as the following:

a. 1. Péter olvas?
2. Peter is reading?

b. 1. A ház magas?
2. The house is large?

Stressing an element in such cases would usually require some other type of construction in English:

c. 1. Péter olvas?
2. Is Peter the one who's reading? (Is it Peter that's reading?)

However, emphasizing the subject in an instance of astonishment or the like can involve inversion in Hungarian, but not in English:

d. 1. Megy a vonat?
2. The train is going?

also: e. 1. Megy vonat?
2. Is there really a train going (there)?

However, this is a very special case, since we have seen that stressing the non-verbal elements in a sentence in Hungarian calls for their placement immediately before the verb. In the case of interrogative sentences in Hungarian the same basic linear sequence of words may be used as in declarative sentences with only interrogative intonation or an interrogative word needed to mark the sentence as a question.

14.2.3 Questions with tag-words. Another type of interrogative structure using direct word order in both languages is that in which a statement is turned into a question by means of a tag-word requesting a yes or no answer regarding the truth-value of the given statement. It is at this point in grammar that the English-speaking student learning Hungarian has a marked advantage over the Hungarian-speaking student studying English, for while the latter has to learn dozens of formally-different tags, can't you?, doesn't he?, isn't it?, and the like, the student of Hungarian can get along with ugye? or nem igaz?, the latter being the close equivalent of the German nicht wahr?,,the Italian non è vero?, and similar expressions in many other languages. While nem igaz? follows the statement portion of the sentence and is separated from it by open juncture, *ugye* generally precedes the statement and is in closer juncture with it. Further contrasts occur both on the sociological and psychological levels in that *ugye* may imply some degree of familiarity between speaker and listener, while the English tags do not. Furthermore *ugye* retains the same form regardless of whether the statement is put in the positive or the negative. English tags, of course, reverse the positive or negative form of the statement while indicating the expectation of a positive answer to the positive statement and a negative reply to the negative statement, regardless of the tag marking:

a. 1. *Ugye* Péter eljön?[1]
  2. Peter is coming, *isn't he*?

b. 1. *Ugye* nem félsz?
  2. You aren't afraid, *are you*?

A discussion of the types of positive and negative answers that can follow such questions will be deferred until Chapter XVI, where phrasal verbs will be discussed. Here, however, we need to discuss a particle in Hungarian which may be labelled a question tag, namely the "interrogative particle" -*e*. This form, which is more often used in indirect questions, may be used to turn a statement into a question expressing slight doubt or incredulity, and since it is a distinctive marker of interrogation, the ensuing question, like those with the interrogative pronouns, does not have the characteristic rising falling intonation contour of other yes-no questions:

c. 1. Tudtok-e szerezni egy harmadik jegyet is?
  2. Can you really get a third ticket too?

Such constructions with -*e*, however, in which the predicate is questioned--which is most often the case--may be also analyzed as inverted word order since there is no strong argument for setting the "logical" place of the "deleted" subject. It is in indirect questions that -e occurs most often, offering several points of contrast with the equivalent English construction since in such cases this interrogative particle expresses relations best rendered in English by the conjunctions if or whether. Two examples may suffice to illustrate this:

d. 1. Nem tudom, hogy el tudunk-e menni.
   2. I don't know whether we can go.

e. 1. Kíváncsi volt, Péter-e az a gyerek.
   2. He was wondering if that child was Peter.

Stronger doubt can be expressed by the addition of the conjunction vajon to reinforce -e:

f. 1. Nem tudom, vajon el tudunk-e menni.
   2. I don't know whether we can go or not.

This conjunction may be used in direct sentences also, with or without -e, other construction types being necessary in English to convey the same sort of doubt, for example:

g. 1. Vajon tudtok-e szerezni egy harmadik jegyet is?
   2. Do you suppose you could get a third ticket too?

h. 1. Szabad vajon oda elmenni idegennek is?
   2. I wonder if foreigners are allowed to go there too.

NOTE TO CHAPTER XIV

1. Sentences a.1 and a.2 are based upon sentences taken from Bánhidi et al. 1965:300. Sentences c.1 and g.1 are taken from the same work, p. 299. I have slightly modified some of the English translations given there. Sentence h.1 is from Tompa 1962:497.

CHAPTER XV

NEGATIVE SENTENCES

15.0 Introduction

Now that we have completed a basic discussion of stress and word order in declarative and interrogative sentences in Hungarian, it is a relatively small matter to treat negative sentences, since almost the identical processes are involved in all three sentence types. The common negative particle in Hungarian, nem, generally bears full stress and therefore precedes the verb, as we have seen to be the case with the interrogative pronouns. Just as with the interrogative pronouns, moreover, other elements in a sentence with nem may be emphasized, that is, "made negative," in which case the negative element will immediately precede the emphasized element, which occupies the usual emphatic position before the verb. Therefore the predicate can be negated with various orders of elements:

a. 1. Nem tanulnak a fiúk, hanem beszélgetnek.
   2. The boys are not studying, but chatting.

b. 1. Most nem tanulnak a fiúk, hanem beszélgetnek.
   2. Now the boys are not studying, but chatting.

c. 1. A fiúk most nem tanulnak, hanem beszélgetnek.
   2. The boys are not studying now, but chatting.

and also any other element:

d. 1. Most nem a fiúk tanulnak, hanem a lányok.
   2. Now it's not the boys who are studying, but the girls.

e. 1. Nem most tanulnak a fiúk, hanem este.
   2. The boys aren't going to study now, but rather tonight.

f. 1. A fiúk nem itt vannak, hanem ott.
   2. The boys aren't here, but there.

Contrasting structures in English and Hungarian display, among other things, the fact that the negative particle precedes the verb, simple or compound, in Hungarian while it follows the verb in English, which, of course, must be provided with a form of do if there is no other auxiliary already present. It seems that only be as a main verb can take not without the use of the auxiliary. However, such structures can be equally interpreted as having the negative refer to the predicate element, rather than the verb itself. In any case, the Hungarian equivalent has either the special negative verb before the locative element, or the negative particle nem immediately before the predicate adjective or noun:

g. 1. Pista nincs itt.
   2. Steve is not here.

h. 1. Pista nem beteg.
   2. Steve is not sick.

i. 1. Pista nem katona.
   2. Steve is not a soldier.

The English constructions, as given above, are somewhat emphatic or formal, unemphatic or less formal situations usually calling for the contracted forms, e.g., isn't and the like. This brings up a contrastive point within English grammar, for the contracted forms display different word order from that of the full forms in questions. The Hungarian equivalents, of course, remain the same:

j. 1. Isn't Steve here?
but 2. Is Steve not here? (*Is not Steve here?)
   3. Nincs itt Pista?

Questions with the uncontracted negative seem to be even more formal or "unusual" in American English than the corresponding non-interrogative structures. The negative questions in Hungarian, on the other hand, have other properties which contrast with the equivalent constructions in English, the main one being the great variety of permutations possible. Just as we have repeatedly seen above with non-negative constructions, almost any element may be questioned in a negative interrogative sentence, the only apparent constraint being that the negative particle must always precede the verb:

k. 1. Péter nem olvassa a levelet?
   2. Nem olvassa a levelet Péter?
   3. Isn't Peter reading the letter?

and l. 1. Nem a levelet olvassa Péter?
   2. Isn't it the letter that Peter's reading?

15.1 Multiple negation

Modern standard English, like the other modern Germanic languages, generally accepts only one negative element in a single clause. Hungarian, on the other hand, as well as the Romance languages (and Shakespearian English) requires--wherever possible--all elements in the same clause to be negative in form. This not only involves interlingual contrasts, but intralingual variation as well, in both English and Hungarian. Thus, while both English and Hungarian have negative pronouns which may be used in similar fashion in isolation, the Hungarian pronouns require that the verb be in the negative also:

a. 1. Nem látok senkit.
   2. I don't see anyone. (also: I see no one.)

b. 1. Itt nincs semmi.
   2. There is nothing here. (There isn't anything here.)

c. 1. Nem megyek sehova.
   2. I'm not going anywhere. (I'm going nowhere.)

More emphatic negation can be shown in Hungarian by placing the negative pronoun in preverbal position, however only in conjunction with the emphatic negative particle se(m) or the emphatic negative copula *sincs*(*en*). The equivalent structures in English may be made emphatic by various means, one of the most common being the employment of the intensifier *at all*, either immediately after the negative element or in clause-final position:

d. 1. *Senkit sem* látok.
    2. I do*n't* see *anyone at all*. (I see *no one at all*.)

e. 1. *Semmi sincs* itt.
    2. There is*n't anything at all* here. (There's *nothing at all* ...)

f. 1. *Sehova sem* megyek soha.
    2. I *never* go *anywhere at all*.

Examples b.1 and e.1 above illustrate a simple but essential bit of grammatical fact in Hungarian, namely, that *nem* + *van* is obligatorily changed to *nincs*(*en*), *nem* + *vannak* to *nincsenek*. The corresponding "emphatic forms" are *sincs* and *sincsenek*, respectively. Since *van* is used not only in locative constructions in the third person, but in introductory possessive constructions in all persons as well, there could be quite a variety of English equivalents. Locative constructions were already illustrated above. The following examples may illustrate possible possessive construction types. We shall give an affirmative sentence for easier comparison:

g. 1. *Van* kocsim.
    2. I *do* have a car.

h. 1. (Nekem) *nincs* kocsim.
    2. I *don't have* a car. (I have *no* car.)

i. 1. Nekem *sincs*.
    2. I *don't* (*have* one) *either*.
or: 3. *Neither do* I.

If we compare the affirmative counterpart of i.1, we see that *sincs* is to *is nincs* as *nincs* is to *nem van*. Cf. *Nekem is van*. 'I have one too.' Therefore, its use is often that of a correlative rather than an intensifier. There are also pairs of negative correlative conjunctions in English and Hungarian, but before we turn to them, there are other aspects of negation in English which ought to be discussed at this point, even though the use of one of them is fairly marginal. This is the use of not + an adjective with the negative prefix un- or in- or its various allomorphs to form a weak affirmative. While in substandard or very informal speech two negatives do not make a positive, in the above (fairly formal) construction type two negatives do indeed make a positive, but an extremely weak one. In, for example, "He is not unwelcome here" the person in question is only grudgingly "welcome." A task, for example, which is "not impossible" is not very possible either. The Hungarian equivalents to these constructions, best described as marginal, may be given as follows: "Nem fogadjuk örömmel," lit. 'We don't receive him with joy.' If, on the other hand, the "double negative" construction occurs as a direct contradiction of a statement just uttered, then the two languages exhibit parallel structures, the second negation being expressed in Hungarian by a suffix however:

j. 1. This is not an impossible task.
2. Ez nem egy lehetetlen feladat.

The other aspect of "negation" which was shown here by example, and which warrants further discussion, is the use of no as a "negative determiner." In h.2 above, for example, no car was given as an equivalent for n't ... a car. In addition to the well-known fact that "I have no car" is definitely acceptable standard while "I don't have no car" is usually labelled "substandard," it might be mentioned here that the former is considered by some speakers of American English to be more "formal" than the n't ... a. Whatever style it might belong to, a construction like _no car_ is very widespread in the language and may induce an English-speaking student learning Hungarian to overwork a superficially similar construction in Hungarian, namely, _semmi_ + noun. The latter construction is quite emphatic and accordingly cannot be used in all cases where _no_ + noun occurs in the corresponding English construction. This was already shown by the example in h. above. Conversely, an occurrence of _semmi_ + noun might necessitate the use of additional intensifiers in English to form an acceptable equivalent, as the following examples may illustrate:

k. 1. semmi kincsért sem (lit. 'for no treasure even')
2. not for any money, 'not for the whole world'

l. 1. semmi esetre sem (lit. 'in no case whatever')
2. by no means

Another contrastive point of grammar might be mentioned at this point for it also can cause difficulty unless the student's attention is directed toward the idiomatic nature of the Hungarian construction. This is the use of _nem_ before adjectives derived from numerals to denote "more than" and not the real negation of the number, for example, _nem egyszer_ (lit. 'not once') = 'more than once, repeatedly.' This type of construction is quite rare in Hungarian, however, except for the combination _nem egy_:

m. 1. _Nem egy_ boldog napot töltöttek el együtt.
2. They spent _many a_ happy day together. (*_not a_ or _not one_)

15.2 _Negative correlative conjunctions_

Bilingual dictionaries generally give _neither_-_nor_ as the equivalents of the Hungarian _se_(_m_)-_se_(_m_). However, as we have seen, if the English verb is negated, then the associated elements generally are not negated in turn:

a. 1. Se igent ne mondj, se nemet.
2. Say neither yes nor no.
or 3. Don't say either yes or no.

Thus we can have one negative in English acting as the equivalent of three negative elements in Hungarian. In elliptical sentences the correlative conjunctions may match one-for-one, as can all of the negative pronouns: se jó, se rossz 'neither good nor bad.' This parallels the use of the pronouns as responses to questions: Senki 'nobody,' semmi 'nothing,' etc., or any of their oblique-case forms: Senkit, etc. Incidentally, it can be seen from a.1 here that the "prohibitive particle" (negative imperative) in Hungarian is not nem, but ne, which is closely equivalent to the English don't: "Menj! Ne menj!" = 'Go! Don't go!' This construction type will be discussed more fully in the following chapter.

247

CHAPTER XVI

THE PHRASAL VERB

16.0 Introduction

Another aspect of Hungarian morpho-syntax in which stress and emphasis play an important role in word order concerns the use of what may be labelled "the phrasal verb." By this term is meant that verbal combination consisting of a simplex verb used in close connection with a "preverb" to form an entirely new lexical item, or to give another aspectual meaning to the basic verb. It can be expected that an English-speaking student of Hungarian would experience a considerable amount of interference in the process of mastering this feature of Hungarian grammar because of the somewhat close morphological resemblance of these verb types with verb types in English consisting of a simplex verb and an adverbial "particle" or a particle and a preposition, for example, _to give up_ = "to surrender," _to put up with_ = "to endure" and a great many others. The reader may be immediately reminded of the verbs in German used with "separable prefixes." However, even a student knowing German would derive very little transference value from a knowledge of the syntax of the German verbs with such "prefixes" when trying to apply this knowledge to an understanding of the syntactic variability of the Hungarian phrasal verbs since the latter deviate syntactically to a quite marked degree from both the German and English counterparts. Morphologically and semantically, however, the resemblance between the Hungarian and the German phrasal verbs is remarkable, for not only can aspectual nuances be expressed with the "older" prefixes, but also new lexical entities created by including new items into the open-ended class of "prefixes" or "preverbs" (*praeverbia*, Hungarian *igekötő* lit. 'verb-binder'). Thus, we not only have the following tri-lingual parallelism:

Hungarian	German	English
enni	essen	to eat
megenni	aufessen	to eat up
menni	gehen	to go
elmenni	weggehen	to go away

and the like, but also quite a few morphological divergencies as well:

ütni	schlagen	to beat
agyonütni (lit. 'on the brain')	totschlagen	to beat to death, to strike dead
menni	gehen	to go
tönkremenni (lit. 'to the block')	zugrundegehen	to deteriorate, to get ruined

and many more. Since the acquiring of new preverbs in Hungarian (and German) is an on-going process, practically any listing of these new verb forms would be incomplete or would contain entries which would be in the transitional stages, and therefore, "disputable," as can often be noted in the fluctuation of orthography, for example, *szert* *tesz* 'get hold of' but *tönkretesz* 'to ruin.' (Cf. *tönkremenni* above.) The older, well-established prefixes, on the other hand, are a closed set, more or less, and can be gotten from any dictionary of Hungarian, and accordingly need not be listed here. However, since the formation of phrasal verbs even with the older prefixes is an extremely viable process, this type of verbal derivation is also open-ended. Practically any Hungarian dictionary will give many examples of such new formations as: *elbarikádoz* 'to barricade' and *lekritizál* 'to criticize adversely,' "to pan," and many others. Our task here, however, is not to analyze the morphologic or semantic properties of the phrasal verbs, which is a task more suited to a good dictionary, but rather to discuss the syntactic behavior of such verbs. It is at the level of syntax that the most interference is likely to occur rather than at the semantic level. How do the various parts of the phrasal verb behave syntactically in typical Hungarian sentences will be the question discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

16.1 Basic order of elements in the Hungarian phrasal verb

In discussing the rules of word order for the "separable" elements of the Hungarian phrasal verb, it is helpful to bear in mind the basic principle of Hungarian word order mentioned repeatedly in the previous chapter, namely that the stressed non-verbal element must immediately precede the verb. This rule can serve as an effective point of departure here, for the verbal prefix often bears the main stress and accordingly occurs immediately before the verb in Hungarian. Thus, since all words of more than one syllable in Hungarian have a strong dynamic accent on the first syllable, a new phonological, as well as semantic "word" is created by the addition of a prefix to a simplex verb and by the concomitant shift in main stress. The reduction of the primary stress on the first syllable in menni 'to eat,' for example, to secondary stress in elmenni 'to go away' is clearly reflected in the traditional orthography where the practice is to write the two-element sequence without a space between them. However, in non-contiguous preverbal position spacing is used, as it is in postverbal position. Primary stress is also the mark of the adverbial elements in the English and German phrasal verbs also, but the syntactic behavior of these elements is somewhat more restricted than their Hungarian counterparts, as can be seen from the following discussion.

16.1.1 *Preverbal position of adverbial element.* For the purposes of the discussion here we will consider the preverbal position of the adverbial element of the phrasal verb in Hungarian to be the basic order, though it is perhaps not the most frequent statistically. While the order of the elements in the English phrasal verb can be shown in a simple paradigm, the Hungarian phrasal verb requires greater discussion because of the syntactic effects of stress and "double" stress. As is well known, the adverbial part of the English phrasal verb always follows the verb, either immediately after the main verb or immediately after the object noun phrase if the latter does not contain a clausal modifier. In the case of personal pronominal objects, however, only the latter position is possible:

a. 1. I'm going to *look* that word *up*.
   2. I'm going to *look* *up* that word.
   3. I'm going to *look* it *up*.
   4. *I'm going to *look* *up* it.

Extensive, postposed modifying elements, either adverbial or adjectival, lying outside the phrasal verb make a sentence in English unacceptable, unlike its German counterpart:

b. 1. I'm going to *look* *up* that word immediately.
   2. *I'm going to *look* that word immediately *up*.
   3. I'm going to *look* that word *up* immediately.

c. 1. I'm going to *look* *up* the word I heard this morning.
   2. *I'm going to *look* the word I heard this morning *up*.
   3. ?I'm going to *look* the word *up* that I heard this morning.

d. 1. I'm going to *look up* that word in the dictionary.
2. I'm going to *look* that word *up* in the dictionary
3. *I'm going to *look* that word in the dictionary *up*. (adv.)
4. ?I'm going to *look* that word in the dictionary *up*. (adj.)

For the sake of completeness here it might be mentioned that there are other phrasal verb types in English, the second elements of which must be considered to be prepositions rather than adverbs, since only preposed position with respect to the object is possible for them, regardless of the type of nominal occurring as object.[1] Verbs with two prepositional elements can also occur:

e. 1. I *came across* a good book yesterday.
2. *I *came* a good book *across* yesterday.

f. 1. I will not *put up with* that man any more.
2. *I will not *put* that man *up with* any more.

Moreover, the unacceptable sentence a.4 given above would be perfectly acceptable if *up* were a preposition interpretable in its basic directional meaning, as, for example, in "There's an open elevator shaft. I'm going to look up it." The verb phrases *look up the word* and *look up the chimney* denote two very different activities. No more will be said here about the above phenomena as we now proceed to a discussion of the Hungarian phrasal verb. By contrast with the English equivalent, then, the Hungarian phrasal verb may have the particle portion occurring before the verb. This may occur with the particle conjoined to the verb, as mentioned above, or separated from it by one or two other elements.

16.1.1.1 *Position immediately before the verb.* In citation form the verbal "prefix" is indeed prefixed. We have already shown examples of this. New unilingual or bilingual dictionaries of Hungarian generally cite the phrasal verb with the verbal element in the third person singular: *elmegy* 'go away,' although the infinitive form can be found in linguistic literature also: *elmenni* 'to go away.' However, preverbal position is also possible within a sentence in which no particular syntagma other than the verb itself is emphasized. This can include affirmative or interrogative sentences with or without an overt subject noun phrase:

a. 1. Pista *el*ment.
   2. Steve left.

b. 1. *El*ment.
   2. He left.

c. 1. *El*ment?
   2. Did he leave?

d. 1. Tessék *le*ülni.
   2. Please sit down.

e. 1. *Haza*megy *át*öltözni.
   2. She's going home to change (clothes).

These sentences are to be regarded as "neutral" as far as emphasis is concerned. This holds for the present participle constructions also:

f. 1. A ház *el*adó.
   2. The house is for sale.

16.1.1.2 *Non-contiguous preverbal position.* The Hungarian "preverb" may also occur before the verb, but separated from it by various auxiliary verbs and the adjective *szabad* 'allowed, permitted,' which is treated by some speakers as an auxiliary verb capable of taking mood and tense markers. The most common auxiliaries of this type are: *van*, *fog*, *kell*, *lehet*, *akar*, *szeret*, *tud*, *szokott*, *szándékoz*, *tetszik*, *muszáj*.[2] *Van* differs from the others by being used with the present gerund and not the infinitive, which in the case of *kell*, *muszáj*, and *szabad* may have personal possessive suffixes (e.g., f.1). Typical examples are:

a. 1. Pista *el* akar menni.[3]
   2. Steve wants to leave.

b. 1. *Ki* fogom fizetni a számlát.
   2. I'm going to pay the bill.

c. 1. Ezt meg kell tanulni.
2. These have to be learned. (One must learn these.)

d. 1. Le szándékozom fordítani.
2. I intend to translate it.

e. 1. A ház el van adva.
2. The house is sold.

f. 1. Nekem el kell mennem.
2. I have to leave.

The clitic is 'also, too' and its negative counterpart se(m), when reinforcing the phrasal verb, also occur between the preverb and the verb:

g. 1. Meg is mondom neki.
2. I'll really tell him.

h. 1. Fel sem állnak.
2. They don't even stand up.

If there are two auxiliaries employed with the phrasal verb, or if the auxiliary itself has an auxiliary, then the adverbial particle precedes both:

i. 1. Ezt le kell tudni írni.
2. One has to be able to describe this.

j. 1. Ezt meg kellett volna tanulni.
2. This should have been learned.

It is also possible to have a preverb both on the auxiliary and on the main verb. These phrasal-verb auxiliaries are very few in number and seem to behave syntactically in the same manner as other phrasal verbs. In this case each preverb acts independently of the other:

k. 1. Holnap megpróbálom megtanulni a verset.
2. I'll try to learn the poem tomorrow.

l. 1. Nem próbálom meg megtanulni.
2. I'm not going to try to learn it.

The preverb on the main verb, however, seems to have less variability in position, as will be indicated by further examples in section 16.1.2.1 below.

16.1.2 *Postverbal position of the adverbial element.* The postposed position of the adverbial particle of the Hungarian phrasal verb may be called the "stressed position", for it occurs when an element other than the verb or prefix is stressed in the sentence. Such stressable elements include, as we have seen in Chapter XIII, such "inherently stressed" syntagmas as the negative *nem*, the interrogative pronouns and, of course, the stressed responses to them, in addition to such considerations as imperative mood and perfective aspect.

16.1.2.1 *Position in negative sentences.* As discussed previously, the negative *nem* can apply to non-verbal elements in a given sentence, in addition to negating the verb. Compare:

a. 1. János nem megy *el*.
   2. John is not leaving.

b. 1. Nem János megy *el*, hanem Pista.
   2. It's not John but Steve who's leaving.

In instances where there is an auxiliary verb used in conjunction with a phrasal verb, the presence of the negative particle displaces the verbal prefix to its conjunctive position before the verb:

c. 1. Pista nem akar *el*menni.
   2. Steve doesn't want to leave.

d. 1. Nem kell *ki*menni.
   2. One doesn't have to go out.

e. 1. A ház még nincs *el*adva.
   2. The house isn't sold yet.

As shown above, an auxiliary may also have its own preverb, and in the case of negation of the "double phrasal verb," either phrasal verb may be negated. In this instance, however, the particle associated with the main verb does not seem to occur in postposed position, although disjoined as well as conjoined preverbal positions are possible without a noticeable difference in meaning. The following examples may not meet the approval of purists, but are nonetheless common in colloquial styles:

f. 1. Nem próbálom meg megbántani.
2. I'm trying not to hurt her feelings.

g. 1. Megpróbálom nem megbántani.
or 2. Meg próbálom meg nem bántani.
3. I'll try not to hurt her feelings.

16.1.2.2 *Position after other stressed elements in the sentence.* Just as any syntagma may be negated, and thereby stressed, in Hungarian, so also can practically any element in a sentence be questioned, and thereby stressed. The respective answers, of course, will likewise be stressed. As we have seen in 16.1.1.1 c.1, the predicate may be questioned, in which case the verbal prefix has the "basic" position: Elment? 'Did he leave?' However, the predicate need not be the sole element in the sentence in order to be questioned and stressed. Compare the placement of the adverbial element in these sentences, then, beginning with the stressed predicate:

a. 1. Mit csinált a katona?	What did the soldier do?
2. A katona felugrott a vonatra.	The soldier jumped onto the train.
b. 1. Ki ugrott fel a vonatra?	Who jumped onto the train?
2. A katona ugrott fel a vonatra	The soldier jumped onto the train.
c. 1. A katona hova ugrott fel?	Where did the soldier jump?
2. A katona a vonatra ugrott fel.	The soldier jumped onto the train.
d. 1. Hova ugrott fel a katona?	Where did the soldier jump?
2. A vonatra ugrott fel a katona.	It was on the train that the soldier jumped.

e. 1.	*A katona* ugrott fel a vonatra?	Was it *the soldier* who jumped on the train?
2.	*A katona* ugrott fel a vonatra.	It was *the soldier* who jumped on the train.

Stress, then, determines the placement of the adverbial particle in otherwise identical sentences:

f. 1.	Feri elment.	Frank left.
2.	*Feri* ment el.	*Frank* left. or: It was *Frank* who left.

In non-emphatic imperative situations the adverbial particle also follows the verb, with or without the prohibitive particle *ne*:

g. 1. Menj el!
2. Go away.

h. 1. Ne menj el!
2. Don't go away.

Finally, imperfective aspect is associated with postverbal position of the adverbial element, perfective with the preposed. Compare the following pairs of sentences:

i. 1.	*Vissza*ment.	He returned.
2.	Ment *vissza*.	He started back.
j. 1.	*Szerte*futottak az emberek.	The people scattered.
2.	Futottak *szerte* az emberek.	The people were dispersing.

while indefiniteness is likewise associated with postposed position, definiteness with preposed:

k. 1.	Orvos ment *be*.	A doctor went in.
2.	Az orvos *be*ment.	The doctor went in.
l. 1.	Mennek *el* betegek.	Patients are leaving.
2.	*El*mennek a betegek.	The patients are leaving.

16.2 *Syntax of the Hungarian phrasal verb in emotionally emphatic sentences*

In instances where a sentence in Hungarian expresses emotional emphasis, "double emphasis," the rules for positioning of the adverbial particle of a phrasal verb are countermanded, so to speak. This involves primarily those cases in which the particle is ordinarily displaced to postverbal position, so that where unemotional stress calls for a displacement of the particle, double stress, or emotional stress, calls for another transformation returning the particle to preposed position. It would be almost equivalent to say that the double-stress transformation merely blocks the single-stress transformation, if it were not for the fact that emotional emphasis moves the particle two places instead of one under certain circumstances.

16.2.1 *Emphatic negative sentences*. While "neutral" negative sentences involve a displacement of the adverbial particle to postposed position, emphatic negative sentences call for the particle to be placed before the verb one or two places. A one-place displacement occurs in negative questions involving display of emotion rather than request for information:

a. 1. Hát nem *el*törte?
   2. Well, didn't he break it?

b. 1. Nem *meg*mondtam?
   2. Well, didn't I say so?

Preposed, conjoined adverbial particles can also be found in those instances where either the particle or the verb portion of the phrasal verb is under strong stress, actually with or without an emotional display:

c. 1. Nem *ki*ment, *ki*dobták!
   2. He didn't go out; he was thrown out!

d. 1. Nem *fel*ment, *le*ment.
   2. He didn't go up. He went down.

The latter construction shows stronger contrast than the otherwise equivalent:

e. 1. Nem ment *fel*, hanem *le*.
2. He didn't go up but down.

A two-place "movement" of the adverbial particle may be illustrated in the following sentence:

f. 1. Ő *el* nem menne az orvoshoz semmi kincsért sem.
2. She wouldn't go to the doctor for all the money in the world.

We have already seen in 16.1.1.2 that emphatic negative *sem* also can occur with the particle preceding it:

g. 1. *Fel* sem állnak.
2. They don't even stand up.

h. 1. *El* sem hinnéd.
2. You wouldn't believe it.

16.2.2 *Emphatic imperatives*. We have seen in 16.1.2.2 (g.1 and h.1) that imperatives, both positive and negative, ordinarily have the prefix following the verb portion of a phrasal verb in Hungarian. In imperatives showing strong emotional involvement, on the other hand, the particle occurs in preverbal position. In negative imperatives, "prohibitives," showing strong emotion the particle likewise precedes the prohibitive particle *ne*. Both types of imperatives here are on the level of threats. Compare the following changes of word order as one proceeds from a question to imperative to emotional command:

Question	*Imperative*	*Emotional Command*
Elmész? Are you leaving?	Menj el! Go away.	Elmenj!! Get out of here!!
Nem mész el? Aren't you leaving?	Ne menj el! Don't leave.	El ne menj!! Don't you dare leave!!

With the inclusion of the "long form" of the imperative, we can, in fact, have three degrees of intensity of imperatives in Hungarian:

"mild"	"normal"	"harsh"
menjél el! you may leave	menj el! go away!	elmenj!! get out of here!!

As can be seen, the syntax of the short and the long imperatives is the same and needs no special treatment here. Needless to say, the emotional state of the speaker uttering (or shouting) such commands as those given in the third column would also be reflected in the "tone of voice" employed at the time, in addition to facial expression, gestures, and the like, all of which might be more clearly recognized by the non-native speaker of Hungarian than the subtleties of syntax reflected in the location of the particle. In the case of emotional commands with an auxiliary, the displacement of the particle may be actually a three-place one. Compare, for example:

a. 1. Ne próbálj kimenni!
2. Don't try to go out.

with: b. 1. Ki ne próbálj menni!!
2. Don't you dare try to get out!

also: c. 1. Meg ne merd próbálni!!
2. Don't you dare try it!

16.3 Reduplication of particles in phrasal verbs

Intensification or reiteration of action can be expressed by the use of "double" prefixes in Hungarian. The former process compares pretty well to the similar use of two adverbial particles of somewhat opposed meaning to intensify the action of the narration. The latter process in Hungarian consists in actually repeating the prefixed element to convey the notion of repeated or frequentative action, a grammatical process which has only a limited parallel in English phrasal verbs. For the purpose of simplicity, both processes will be included under the label "reduplication."

16.3.1 Intensification expressed by "double prefixes." English and Hungarian agree in the use of two adverbial particles to convey the idea of intensification of action. Within an utterance, however, the corresponding double particles have their own syntactic peculiarities, as can be expected. Nevertheless, it can be seen from the examples below that the two elements in question behave syntactically as one in their respective sentences:

a. 1. Itt állandóan járnak ki-be.
   2. People continually go in and out here.

b. 1. Nyugtalanul sétált fel-alá.
   2. He walked up and down restlessly.

From the position of the preverbs in the Hungarian sentences, it can be seen that the adverbs of manner happen to be stressed in both cases here.

16.3.2 Reduplicated particle as frequentative marker. The effect achieved in Hungarian by the use of two identical preverbs in one phrasal verb cannot be duplicated in English solely by the repetition of the adverbial element in a phrasal verb. Reduplication in English, while certainly frequent in some styles of speech and writing, generally implies intensification, and not necessarily reiteration of action. The effect attained by the repeated elements in such constructions as: "Down, down he went into the abyss," and "Up! Up! And awaaay!" is not the same as expressed in the reduplicated preverb in Hungarian. The latter indicates that the action is initiated on more than one occasion, as can be seen in the following examples:

a. 1. Be-bejár az irodámba.
   2. He comes to my office from time to time.

b. 1. Meg-megáll, körülnéz.
   2. Now and then he stops and looks around.

c. 1. Elment, de vissza-visszatekintett.
2. He left, but he kept glancing back.

16.4 Preverbs in elliptical responses to yes-no questions

As indicated in various sections of Chapter XIV, almost any element in a Hungarian sentence may be questioned by the employment of proper stress and word order. In the event the predicate of an interrogative sentence is a phrasal verb, the prefix normally follows the verb in all instances where the whole verb or the prefix itself is not specifically questioned. The responses to such questions also contain elements that are stressed. Accordingly, the responses also contain postposed particles. If, on the other hand, the predicate itself is questioned, then both the question and answer contain the preposed particle. In fact, both may have the identical word order, as is the case when the subject (or other elements) are questioned in yes-no questions. Compare the following pairs of sentences:

a. 1. A katona ugrott fel a vonatra?	Was it the soldier ...?
2. A katona ugrott fel a vonatra.	It was the soldier ...
b. 1. Felugrott a katona a vonatra?	Did the soldier jump ...?
2. Felugrott a katona a vonatra.	The soldier did jump ...

It goes without saying, however, that in actual conversational situations speakers tend to avoid repetition of material clearly established in the discourse. Therefore, typical answers to such questions as those given above generally concentrate on the specific affirmative or negative nature of the response, rather than on the mutually-known contextual material. This concentration is achieved by elision of all but the most essential information--within the limits of politeness, of course--in both English and

Hungarian, but with different types of grammatical elements being employed toward this end. Questioning elements other than the phrasal verb calls for elision of the whole verb in Hungarian with a contrasting structure in English. Questioning the verb, on the other hand, calls for ellipsis of all but the verb or particle, again with contrasting structures in English. For the sake of comparison we will discuss the elision of the entire predicate first.

16.4.1 Elision of predicate in response. A question such as a.1 above has both phonological and syntactic indications of the fact that the subject is the topic of enquiry. The English equivalent requires an entirely different type of construction from the Hungarian. The respective responses, however, obviously show the same type of constructions with only minor transformations marking the differences. The elliptical answers are likewise simple deletion transformations of the respective full responses:

full: a. 1. A katona ugrott fel a vonatra.
2. It was the soldier who jumped onto the train.

b. 1. (Igen), a katona.
2. Yes, it was.

Since the element questioned here is a noun phrase, the affirmative answer in Hungarian may equally consist of the pronoun az (see 6.4.2.1.1):

c. 1. (Igen), az.
2. Yes, it was.

Depending on the social circumstances, igen or yes may of course suffice as polite responses here. If, on the other hand, the predicate is questioned, then there are elliptical possibilities in Hungarian which have other counterparts in English.

16.4.2 *Phrasal-verb predicate as response*. In instances where the predicate is questioned, the predicate in Hungarian may serve as the affirmative response. In the case of a prefixed verb there are two common possibilities:

full: a. 1. *Fel*ugrott a katona a vonatra.
2. The soldier did jump onto the train.

b. 1. (Igen), *fel*ugrott.
2. Yes, he *did*.

or: c. 1. (Igen), *fel*.
2. Yes, he *did*.

Thus we see that the adverbial particle substitutes for the phrasal verb as an affirmative response in the same way that *az* substitutes for the noun phrase in parallel situations, and, again depending on the social situation, both *az* and any of the verbal prefixes may serve as sufficiently polite answers to yes-no questions. Predicates with auxiliaries, however, may involve the inclusion of the auxiliary in the response, as in English. Thus, we have:

	d.	1. *El*jössz?	Are you coming along?
		2. *El*.	Yes, (I am).
but:	e.	1. *El* kellene mennem oda?	Should I go there?
		2. (Igen), *el*(kellene).	Yes, you should.

A further interlingual contrast is noted in emphatic responses of the above type since the stressed intensifier must precede the auxiliary in English, but must follow in Hungarian. In addition, the Hungarian reply is prefixed by *de*, which in other contexts is the equivalent of *but*, but which here is a close equivalent of the French *mais* in "Mais oui," as will be shown by further examples below. Two possible emphatic answers of this type are:

f.	1. *Ki*küldted az értesítést?	Did you send out the notice?
	2. De *ki* ám.	I certainly did.
	3. De *ki* bizony.	"I sure did."

16.4.3 *Negative responses with phrasal verb.* It is necessary at this point to contrast the Hungarian affirmative answers outlined above with their negative counterparts to note the differences in syntactic behavior. Note the differences in the following:

		Affirmative	*Negative*
a.	1.	*Fel*ugrott a katona.	Nem ugrott *fel* a katona.
	2.	The soldier did jump up.	The soldier did not jump up.
b.	1.	(Igen), *fel*ugrott.	(Nem), nem ugrott *fel*.
	2.	Yes, he did (jump up).	No, he didn't (jump up).
c.	1.	*Fel* kellet ugrani.	Nem kellet *fel*ugrania.
	2.	He had to jump up.	He didn't have to jump up.
d.	1.	*Fel* kellet.	Nem kellet.
	2.	He had to.	He didn't have to.
e.	1.	*Fel*.	Nem.
	2.	Yes, (he did).	No, (he didn't).

Sentences a.1 and b.1 are possible answers to a question formed from the same elements as a.1, and the rest are possible answers answering a question formed from the same elements and same sequence as c.1. The affirmative answers may all have *igen* as an optional element, while the negative ones may have the sentence-modifying *nem*, 'no,' in addition to the predicate-modifying *nem* 'not.'

16.4.4 *Affirmative responses to negative questions.* While negative responses have the same form regardless of whether the question was put negatively or affirmatively, positive answers to a negative question in Hungarian exhibit one important contrastive feature worthy of discussion here, namely the use of *de* as a marker of the contradictory affirmative, generally in conjunction with *igen*. Comparing affirmative replies to a question, first in the positive, then in the negative, we may have:

a. 1.	El kellene menni?	Should we go?
2.	(Igen), el kellene.	Yes, we should.
3.	(Igen), el.	Yes, (we should).
b. 1.	Nem kellene elmenni?	Shouldn't we go?
2.	De igen, el kellene.	Yes, we should.
3.	De igen, el.	Yes, we should.
4.	De igen.	Yes. (Why, yes.)

16.5 Example of literary use of phrasal verb

It may be of interest at this point to illustrate the various patterns displayed by a phrasal verb under varying conditions of emphasis. The following is a literary passage quoted by Sauvageot (1951:145) which has four occurrences of the phrasal verb *megtenni* 'to do (it)':

> Nagyon szeretné *megtenni*, érzi,
> hogy *meg* kellene *tennie*, bolond is
> volna, ha nem *tenné* *meg*,--és mégis
> tudja, hogy sohasem fogja *megtenni*.
>
> He would like very much to do it.
> He feels he ought to do it. He
> would indeed be crazy if he didn't
> do it, and yet he knows that he'll
> never do it.

Placement of the adverbial element clearly indicates where the points of emphasis lie.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVI

1. There are also, of course, verbs with "inseparable prefixes" in English (and German). However, these do not behave syntactically in any way different from a simplex verb in the respective languages. Such prefixed verbs may be contrasted, either in jest or in earnest, with similar phrasal verbs, e.g., as in Mae West's famous quip: "I'd rather be *looked over* than *overlooked*."

2. As an auxiliary verb, *van* occurs with the present gerund to form the "statal passive": *A ház el van adva.* 'The house is sold.' *Fog* is the auxiliary of the periphrastic future: *fog menni* 'will go.' *Kell*, *lehet*, and *tud* may be labelled "modal auxiliaries" and are often equivalent to English *must*, *may*, and *can*, respectively. *Muszáj* is a colloquial equivalent of *kell*. *Akar* 'want,' *szeret* 'like,' and *szándékoz* 'intend' generally offer little difficulty for English-speaking students. *Szokott*, on the other hand, is past in form and therefore can be misinterpreted as 'used to' since it denotes repeated or customary action. However, since it is used for designating present-time actions, the English equivalents are best rendered by *usually/generally* + verb, or by the use of the non-continuous present tense form. *Tetszik* is a polite "filler": *Le tetszik ülni?* 'Would you care to sit down?' *El tetszik menni?* 'Are you leaving, (sir/ma'am)?'

3. The examples given in the rest of this chapter have been collected over a period of five years. Accordingly, it is no longer possible to state the exact source of every sentence, especially the more colloquial ones. The examples taken from written sources may all be documented, but since all of the sentences have been checked by a native informant and found to be acceptable, it was not felt necessary to list every single source. Bánhidi and Jókay 1962:417, Bánhidi et al. 1965:275 and 399, and Tompa 1962:476 were especially useful sources for examples used in this chapter.

PART FOUR

GRAMMATICAL-SEMANTIC NOTIONS

INTRODUCTION TO PART FOUR

We have already considered a specific syntactic area which could actually have been given a "grammatical-semantic" label, namely the category of definiteness, which, as we have seen, involves notional as well as grammatical considerations. While stress and word order involve little that could be called semantics, we may return to semantic-grammatical areas by discussing several very important features of grammar which do depend, in part, at least, on how real-world events or entities are viewed. Only three broad areas will be considered here, each of which could be discussed in a work of monograph proportions. These areas are time and tense, aspect, and number. We shall discuss them in that order.

CHAPTER XVII

TIME AND TENSE USAGE

17.0 Introduction

It would be a banality to say that an English-speaking student of Hungarian would be expected to experience a considerable amount of difficulty in attempting to "map" his elaborate native tense system onto the relatively restricted tense system of Hungarian. Although both languages agree in having only two "simple" tenses, i.e., one-word forms, English has a fairly elaborate system of verbal combinations, up to four words in length, which have only partially corresponding equivalents in Hungarian. Moreover, the varied uses to which one form or combination of forms may be put pose special contrastive problems, even after one has noted what might be the "basic" tense correspondences in the two languages under discussion. The combination would go, for example, requires at least three different forms as equivalents in Hungarian in such sentences as:

a. 1. He would go there if we asked him to.
   2. He said he would go there tomorrow.
   3. Every day he would go into the same bar and order the same drink.

The last sentence shows another feature of English "tense" forms, namely that they express more about the aspect of the action than about the time, a feature, of course, quite evident in the use of the "continuous" forms in English, various adverbials being required in Hungarian to convey more or less the same semantic import. All this is in addition to the fact that moods also play an important role in considerations of tense in English. Moreover, the picture may be further complicated by the fact that English has two voices in which verb forms may appear, while Hungarian, as we have seen, has two conjugations for all tense forms. Since we have dealt fairly extensively with matters pertaining to the employment of the definite conjugation, we need not elaborate any further on the latter topic. However, all of the other factors mentioned above warrant fuller discussion, beginning with the simple forms.

17.1 Simple tense forms

Leaving aside philosophical argument as to the nature of time,[1] we will assume time to be an objective reality capable of being viewed from either the internal, i.e., personal, point of view or from the external, i.e., measurable, recursive sequence of natural events. It is the first of these that reflects itself most noticeably in the tense systems of English and Hungarian, and it is here that we will concentrate most of our attention in this chapter.[2]

17.1.1 "Present tense" usage in English and Hungarian. In this section we are using the term "present tense" as a convenient label for the simple verb forms in either English or Hungarian which, among other things, are employed to designate "generic time" (Jespersen 1965:259), as in the following "timeless" statements:

a. 1. The Earth revolves around the sun.
   2. A Föld a Nap korul kering.

b. 1. A víz 100 foknál forr.
   2. Water boils at 100 degrees.

In addition to designating such timeless, natural events as above, the present tense forms of both English and Hungarian are used to indicate events which are habitually repeated, without any reference to laws of nature:

c. 1. Minden nap moziba *megy*.
2. He *goes* to the movies every day.

However, in designating other types of events and their reference to the time of the discourse, there are a considerable number of interlingual contrasts. Indeed, it becomes quite evident that the term "present tense" is a misnomer for these simple verb forms in both English and Hungarian. Nor is the widespread label "non-past" entirely satisfactory, for it is quite obvious that the forms commonly designated "present tense" forms may be used in reference to *past*, *present*, and *future* time under various circumstances. It is our intention here to view these circumstances to determine what contrasting and what comparable processes are employed by the two different languages under study.

17.1.1.1 *"Present tense" to designate past events*. In both English and Hungarian the present tense may be employed as the so-called "historical present" in narrating past events. This term is also an unfortunate designation, for rather than lending a flavor of antiquity, or anything of that nature, to the narrative, this employment of the present tense lends vividness, immediacy, to the retelling and may be more aptly called "dramatic present." The dramatic present seems to be more common in Hungarian than in English, where to me it smacks a little of the substandard or provincial:

a. 1. So there I *am* yesterday, walking down the street, when this guy *comes* up to me and *says* ...
2. Tegnap *megyek* az utcán, amint egy illető *odajön* és azt *mondja*, hogy ...

The present tense can also be used to relate a past-time event in Hungarian in reported speech if the present tense was used in the original speech act. The tense of the equivalent in English depends on the tense of the verb of reporting, a past-tense verb usually being followed by a verb in the past tense, regardless of the tense of the verb in the original discourse. It may serve a useful purpose here to illustrate this interlingual contrast at this point, although more will be said in this regard in 18.2.2 below:

b. 1. I asked what he was doing.
   2. (Azt) kérdeztem, hogy mit csinál. (pres.)

It is clear that, although the action designated by the present-tense form csinál is in the past with respect to the reporting, i.e., the second speech event, it was an on-going activity with respect to the asking, the first speech event. It will be shown below that the English pattern can produce anomalies when it comes to reporting of events which are still on-going at the time of the reporting of the speech event.

17.1.1.2 "Present tense" to indicate on-going events. The simple present tense form in both English and Hungarian can be used to indicate a simple on-going event, in addition to the "timeless" and repeated events mentioned in 17.1.1 above. However, in this area there are so many intralingual and interlingual contrasts that it is best to discuss this point separately. The problem here lies in the fact that while Hungarian has only one tense to designate present-time activities, English has the simple present, the present continuous, the present perfect, the present perfect continuous, in addition to the "emphatic" (or negative and interrogative) form with do. While the present continuous tense is the favored tense for indicating on-going events in conversational English, it is a well-known fact that a considerable number of verbs in English ordinarily do not occur in this form in non-emphatic uses except in secondary meanings.[3] The verb to be, moreover, does not occur in the present continuous if a permanent characterization is intended by the predicate adjective:

a. 1. You are silly.
vs. 2. You are being silly.

The reader might be immediately reminded of the contrast, under similar circumstances, that can be made between ser and estar in Spanish. Hungarian, on the other hand, has no paradigmatic means of making such contrasts and has to achieve the same results by other means, including differing verb forms. The above sentences, then, may be rendered into Hungarian as follows:

b. 1. Te ostoba vagy. ('are')
2. Te ostobán viselkedsz. ('behave')

Since it is possible to indicate the temporary (and often amateurish) engagement in an activity by the frequentative morpheme -skod-, a.2 may also be rendered:

3. Te ostobáskodsz.

A few of the English verbs listed in footnote 3 can be used in the present continuous only when used in secondary meanings, two different verbs being required to convey the same semantic import in Hungarian:

c. 1. I see a man out there. (*am seeing)
2. Látok egy embert odakint.

vs. d. 1. Steve is seeing a lot of Kate these days. (visits her often)
2. Pista sokszor találkozik Katóval mostanában. ('meets')

and: e. 1. I'm seeing my doctor this afternoon.
2. Ma délután az orvosomhoz megyek. ('going')

Thus, while some verbs in English can hardly occur in the continuous form and will accordingly present fewer problems for the student searching for equivalents in Hungarian, it goes without saying that the student has to be especially alert in recognizing the idiomatic nature of some English verbs, as illustrated above, and seek out different lexical items as proper equivalents in Hungarian. A further illustration of this fact would be the verb *appear* in contrast with the verb *resemble*, for example, which occurs only in the simple present form:

f. 1. He *resembles* his father.
   2. *Hasonlít* az apjához.

but: g. 1. He *appears* sick.
   2. Betegnek *látszik*. ('seems')

vs. h. 1. He'*s* *appearing* there today.
   2. Ott *szerepel* ma. ('plays a role') (also: *lép* *fel*)

and so on. This whole phenomenon, of course, is another illustration of the truism that extensive one-to-one correspondences can hardly be expected between the "equivalent" forms of two different languages, even though these forms otherwise resemble each other in many respects.

17.1.1.2.1 *Hungarian simple present vs. other forms in English*. As mentioned above, the continuous tense in English is the favored tense to indicate an on-going event while the Hungarian form appears in the present. Several examples may suffice here to illustrate this common phenomenon:

a. 1. The man'*s* *looking* at me.
   2. Az ember engemet *néz*.

b. 1. *Is*n't the baby *sleeping*?
   2. A kisbaba nem *alszik*?

The currency of the on-going event may be marked in English by adverbs, of course, some of the most common being *now*, *today*, etc., and *always*, which is frequently used in hyperbole:

c. 1. What *is* she *doing* now?
   2. Mit *csinál* most?

d. 1. Where *is* he *working* today?
2. Hol *dolgozik* ma?

e. 1. He'*s* always *complaining*.
2. Mindig *panaszkodik*.

It is also a well-known fact that the simple present tense in Hungarian, and in many other languages of Europe, is used in situations where the equivalent in English requires the present perfect tense. Whenever the duration or extent of an on-going activity is indicated or questioned by a suitable time-adverbial, the present perfect is called for in English. It should be noted, however, that those verbs which ordinarily occur in the continuous form to designate unmarked on-going events do occur in the present perfect continuous also:

f. 1. How long *have* you *been* here? (**are*)
2. Mióta *vagy* itt?

but: g. 1. How long *have* you *been* *waiting* for him? (**wait* or *are ... waiting*)
2. Mióta *vársz* rá?

Much more will be said of the continuous tenses in the discussion of aspect below.

17.1.1.3 *Simple "present" to indicate future events.* The simple present tense in both English and Hungarian can be employed to designate events which are to take place in the future. This practice is especially common in both languages in instances where the time adverbial clearly marks the futurity of the action, as with *tomorrow*, *next week/month/year*, etc., and their Hungarian equivalents *holnap*, *jövő héten/hónapban/évben*, etc. This use of the present form is much more prevalent in Hungarian than it is in English since, as we have seen, there are other alternates to the simple present tense in the latter language which may also be used in this way, not to mention the fact that English has several periphrastic futures which are commonly used. In my dialect the use of the present as a future is restricted to two principal uses: 1) optionally to indicate each of a series of future events, and 2) obligatorily to indicate a futurity after a future and a temporal conjunction. Several examples of 1) are:

a. 1. I *leave* for Vienna tomorrow. (also: *am leaving*, *I'll leave*, *am going to leave*, etc.)
   2. Holnap *indulok* Bécsbe.

b. 1. First we go to Vienna, then to Rome.
   2. Először Bécsbe, utána Rómába megyünk.

In giving examples of the obligatory use of the future tense in English, we can at the same time indicate where the *present* tense cannot be used to indicate futurity in English, while the Hungarian equivalent may still be indicated by the use of the present. Thus, in the main clause in each of the following sentences, the unmarked futurity must be indicated by the periphrastic future in English, while in the dependent clause futurity is already marked and need not be represented in the verb form. The Hungarian equivalent sentences may have the present tense in both cases:

c. 1. *I'll send* you a post card when I *arrive*. (**send*; **(wi)ll arrive*)
   2. *Küldök* egy képeslapot, amint *megérkezek*.

d. 1. I *won't leave* the house until she *phones*. (**don't leave*; **will phone*)
   2. Addig nem *hagyom* el a házat, amíg fel nem hív telefonon.

The two Hungarian sentences immediately above illustrate at least two other features of Hungarian grammar which may be profitably discussed at this point, namely, 1) Hungarian does have a periphrastic future, like English, which may be used instead of the present tense, as in c.2, for example, and 2) Hungarian may view the *continuity* of an on-going event while the parallel situation in English is considered from the point of view of the future *termination* of the event. In discussing point 1) it should be mentioned that the Hungarian periphrastic future may be manipulated to indicate varying degrees of certainty of the fulfillment of the future event. Thus, c.2 can have at least the following variants, the second being more emphatic:

e. 1. *Küldeni fogok* egy képeslapot, amint megérkezek.
   2. I'*ll send* you a post card when I arrive.

f. 1. *Fogok küldeni* egy képeslapot, amint megérkezek.
   2. I *will send* you a post card when I arrive.
      (or *promise to*)

Emphasis on the auxiliary, in f.2, for example, may achieve the same effect in English that is achieved by inversion in Hungarian. Point 2) as discussed above manifests itself most notably in the negation of the second verb. This means that the activity designated by the first-mentioned verb continues during the time that the activity designated by the second verb has *not* been completed. Thus d.2, which happens to have a negative in the main clause also, may be paraphrased: 'My act of leaving the house will not take place during the time that her phone call has not been placed.' However, this characteristic feature of Hungarian grammar is not irrevocably rooted in the grammatical system, as is evidenced by the fact that the negative is optional in many instances. Several examples of this tendency may suffice:

g. 1. Addig nem tudok választ adni, amíg(*nem*) beszélem
      meg a dolgot a feleségemmel.
   2. I can't give you an answer until I discuss the matter with my wife.

h. 1. Pista addig gyalogolt, amíg egy kunyhóra (*nem*)
      talált.
   2. Steve walked until he found a hut.

As evidenced by the last example, the to-be-completed action could actually be completed with respect to a later speech event, but viewed from the time of the first event, it was still to be fulfilled.

17.1.2 *Simple past tense.* Just as we have seen one simple form in Hungarian corresponding to several present-tense forms in English, so also can we find just one past form in Hungarian corresponding to various past-tense possibilities in English. There are many points of agreement in the uses of the respective simple past tenses of Hungarian and English, but obviously many points of contrast as well, which we will attempt to bring out in detail here. One point of agreement is found in the indication of events considered past with respect to the time of the speech event and not to other events in the discourse itself. Thus we have:

a. 1. I *went* to the movies last night.
   2. Tegnap este moziba *mentem*.

b. 1. Where *were* you last night?
   2. Hol *voltál* tegnap este?

Interrogation of other past-tense verbs in English, of course, requires the use of the past tense of the interrogative auxiliary *do* with the inversion of subject and auxiliary, while the corresponding Hungarian simple verbs require neither an interrogative auxiliary nor inversion. We have already had numerous examples of this simple fact scattered throughout this study, and consequently need but one illustration here:

c. 1. Where *did* you *go*?
   2. Hova *mentél*?

Needless to say, the above is only one area in which the simple past in Hungarian requires a composite form in English, some of which we will now proceed to discuss.

17.1.2.1 *Simple past in Hungarian vs. present perfect in English.* The present perfect tense needs special discussion here for it not only designates on-going events begun in the past, requiring, as we have seen, the Hungarian present tense for proper translation, but also past events, the effects of which are still felt in the discourse situation. These latter instances naturally require the verb to be in the simple past in Hungarian sentences of the same semantic import. The immediacy of the effect of the events designated by the verbs in the present perfect in English is often strengthened by the employment of such adverbs as *yet*, *already*, *just*, etc., but these need not be present for the verb form to achieve its proper effect:

a. 1. I'*ve* *seen* that film already.
2. Azt a filmet már *láttam*.

b. 1. John *hasn't* *come* yet.
2. János még nem *jott* meg.

The important feature of the use of the present perfect tense in English is the fact that the effects of the event indicated by the given verb are still being felt, or that if the action of the verb has not yet been fulfilled, it is still capable of being fulfilled. This convention may be illustrated by contrasts in tense form in English, the Hungarian equivalent often employing the adverb *már* to indicate the open-endedness of the situation in regard to final fulfillment:

c. 1. *Have* you *seen* the Picasso exhibit? (It's still on.)
2. *Láttad* *már* a Picasso-kiállítást?

vs. d. 1. *Did* you *see* the Picasso exhibit? (It's over.)
2. *Láttad* a Picasso-kiállítást?

This contrast is especially striking in the negative, where the present perfect may even have a time limit placed on the possibility of fulfillment of the action stated by the verb. In this case the adverbial *még nem* 'not yet' is used in Hungarian to convey the idea of open-endedness in the equivalent sentence:

e. 1. I haven't shaved this morning.
(said before noon; "I still may.")
2. I didn't shave this morning.
(said after noon, or if before, then with meaning: "I don't intend to.")

The adverb *yet* may be used to reinforce the idea that the non-fulfilled action may still be completed, thereby paralleling the Hungarian *még nem*, but its use is optional:

f. 1. I have*n't* shaved (*yet*) today.
2. Ma *még nem* borotválkoztam.

Many subtleties of meaning can be achieved by the use of the present perfect (as opposed to the simple past in English) to the effect that the results of the *completed* action are still valid. In some instances it is difficult to separate this effect from the mere fact of open-endedness, since past events may be repeated even while their effects are still being felt. It may prove useful to give further examples here, showing by paraphrase the semantic effect of the present perfect:

g. 1. I've read *David Copperfield*. (Therefore I know the work.)
vs. 2. I read *David Copperfield*. (I'm reporting a simple fact.)

h. 1. I've read this book five times.
(Either: I know the work, or I may read it again.)
vs. 2. I read this book five times. (fact)

While the Hungarian equivalent sentences must use different means of expressing the contrast achieved in English by the use of the present perfect versus the simple past to indicate the possibility of completed action, Hungarian does seem to have a similar contrast in the use of the simple past vs. the simple present in instances where the duration of an activity (or the non-fulfillment of the activity) is indicated:

i. 1. We haven't seen Mary for several months.
   2. Máriát több hónapja nem láttuk. (past; possibilities closed)
   3. Máriát több hónapja nem látjuk. (pres.; possibilities open)

A further interlingual contrast along these lines is found in the use of the simple past in Hungarian with the placement of the adverb in various positions in the sentence to denote expectation of the fulfillment in one instance and surprise in the other, an effect achieved in English by the use of two different adverbs:

j. 1. A gyerekek elmentek már iskolába?
   2. Have the children gone to school yet?

k. 1. Már elmentek a gyerekek iskolába?
   2. Have the children gone to school already?

It might be pointed out at this juncture that Hungarian often does not make a clear-cut distinction between the duration of an event and the point of time at which the event took place or terminated. Thus, one and the same time adverbial may be used in reference to these differing aspects of time. In the case of the present tense (present perfect in English) such adverbials indicate the duration of the on-going activity; with the past tense, on the other hand, the identical adverbs indicate a point in time:

l. 1. Két éve, hogy itt van.
   2. He has been here for two years.

m. 1. Két éve, hogy itt volt.
   2. He was here two years ago. (*has been)

Ambiguities are possible with the use of óra 'hour,' which is homophonous with óra 'o'clock,' when the suffix -ig is used since it is used equally for indicating duration and point of time:

n. 1. Két óráig dolgozott.
   2. He worked for two hours.
or: 3. He worked until two o'clock.

In neither case can the English present perfect be used here since it would indicate that the event is on-going when used in conjunction with an adverb of duration, or is repeated when used with such adverbials as until phrases. Other adverbs indicating more or less definite points in past time are completely incompatible with the present perfect, as can be illustrated in the following examples:

o. 1. *I have gone to the movies yesterday.
   2. *She has met him two years ago.

Teachers of English to speakers of other languages might recognize these as being typical of mistakes made as a result of the interference with the use of the present perfect in German in such instances. This does bring up a point of contrast between English and Hungarian word order when both a time adverbial and a place adverbial are present in the same sentence. Hungarian agrees with the German practice in placing the time adverbial before place designations. English, of course, has the reverse order:

p. 1. Már tíz hónapja távol van.
   2. He has been away ten months now. (*ten months away)

q. 1. Tíz éve lakik Budapesten.
   2. He has lived in Budapest (for) ten years.

This order holds in Hungarian even when the adverbs are not contiguous, although, naturally, any syntactic element may be taken out of its normal order and placed elsewhere in the sentence for the sake of emphasis. This holds especially for time adverbials in English, but almost any element in Hungarian, as we have seen in Chapter XIII.

17.2 Composite tense forms

Although we have occasionally spoken of composite tense forms in the first section of this chapter as possible or necessary equivalents of Hungarian simple tenses, it is necessary to discuss the multiple-forms here because we have not fully exploited the full range of "meanings" possible with the numerous compound verbs of English. In addition to this, Hungarian has several composite forms of its own which are worthy of discussion here. We shall begin with the forms which show the greatest amount of similarity between the two languages, namely the periphrastic futures.

17.2.1 The periphrastic futures in English and Hungarian. We have seen that while both English and Hungarian can, to varying degrees, use the simple present tenses to indicate future action, in addition, however, both languages have recourse to a composite form to indicate future events with varying amounts of certainty as to fulfillment. As indicated in 17.1.2, the composite future in Hungarian may be used to indicate certain action by the prepositioning of the verb with the auxiliary in very first position. Although traditional grammars place great emphasis on the fact that the English future auxiliary will was originally a full verb signifying an act of volition, there seems to me to be very little left of strong determination in the auxiliary will, which, unless stressed, is contracted to 'll in most cases. Moreover, even the stressed form of the future may be replaced by other verbs, or verb-adverb combinations, to indicate varying degrees of determination regarding the future action. Thus, starting with "neutral" indications of future action, a form of fog serving as the future auxiliary in Hungarian, we have:

a. 1. (Majd) meg fogom tenni.
   2. I'll do it (later).

b. 1. Mennyi ideig fog tartani a munka?
   2. How long will the work last?

Stressing the immediacy of the future action, we may also have, for example:

c. 1. We are (just) about to leave.
2. Mi éppen indulóban/indulófélben vagyunk.

or: d. 1. We are ready to leave.
2. Éppen indulásra készen vagyunk.

vs: e. 1. We'll leave.
2. Indulni fogunk.

Using the present continuous tense in English instead of the future also lends immediacy to the action, while the corresponding Hungarian sentence generally employs the present tense to achieve the same effect, the future not being excluded, however:

f. 1. She's flying to Vienna tomorrow.
2. Holnap Bécsbe repül. (fog repülni)

g. 1. He's getting married soon.
2. Rövidesen megnősül.

h. 1. I'm going on vacation in July.
2. Juliusban szabadságra megyek.

Another extremely common verbal combination for expressing more or less certainty with respect to future actions in English is going to, which in some varieties of American English has virtually ousted will as the current sign of the future:

i. 1. She's going to fly to Vienna tomorrow.
2. I'm going to go on vacation in July.

all of which would have the same Hungarian equivalents as already indicated. Certainty, coupled with varying degrees of moral or social obligation, may also be expressed in English by the use of is to in place of will. The Hungarian equivalents will vary according to the amount of obligation intended to be conveyed:

j. 1. She is to fly to Vienna tomorrow.
2. Tervek szerint holnap Bécsbe repül. ('according to plans')

If the certainty expressed by is to is quite strong, then, of course, other lexical items may be substituted for the auxiliary:

k. 1. He *is to* stay for three weeks.
or: 2. He *intends to* stay for three weeks.
3. Három hétig *szándékozik* maradni.

It goes without saying that almost any number of adverbs may be used to indicate various degrees of certainty of future action, ranging from *probably* 'valoszinüleg' to *absolutely* 'feltétlenul' and covering everything in between. However, this is more a matter of semantics than syntax and cannot be pursued further here. One morpho-syntactic item that ought to be mentioned at this point, however, is the fact that Hungarian has a special future form of the verb *van* 'is,' namely *lesz*.[4] Several examples may be given here:

l. 1. Ötven éves *leszek* a következő születésnapomon.
2. I'*ll be* fifty on my next birthday.

m. 1. Holnap vasárnap *lesz*.
2. Tomorrow will be Sunday.

17.2.1.1 *The periphrastic future as a polite request in English*. Up to this point in our study we have assumed that *will* is the only viable auxiliary used in the periphrastic future in American English. This means we can ignore *shall* here for all practical purposes, except for one widespread use, namely in interrogative sentences with a first-person subject. Upon inspection of several examples of this usage, one must, in fact, conclude that *shall* is actually no longer a future auxiliary, but rather a "polite interrogative" and, as such, should not be translated by the future in Hungarian, as is sometimes done in textbooks of English. (See, for example, Tarján and Korenchy 1965:62.) In a typical English sentence such as a.1 below, for example, an opinion is requested, while in a.2 a factual yes-no answer is sought in regard to the future action:

a. 1. *Shall* we *work* on Sunday?
vs. 2. *Are* we *going to work* on Sunday?

Hungarian equivalents of the polite requests marked by *shall* are best rendered by the appropriate verb in the imperative, as in the following examples:

b. 1. Where *shall* we *go*?
2. Hova menjunk?

c. 1. *Shall* I *open* the window?
2. *Kinyissam* az ablakot?

That these are polite requests rather than questions relating to futurity is clearly evidenced by the variety of formulas used as a substitute for *shall* by speakers who feel this form is too formal. Some of these are:

d. 1. *Do you mind if* I close the window?
2. *Is it all right if* I close the window?
or: 3. *Do you want me to* close the window?
or even: 4. *How about if* I close the window?

all of which may be rendered by the verbs in the imperative in Hungarian or the polite *szabad*? 'may I?', e.g., "Szabad becsuknom?" 'May I close it?' However, discussing such formulas further here, as important as they are in a complete grammar of either language under study, leads too far out of the realm of syntax.

17.2.2 *Other composite verb forms in Hungarian.* In the previous sections of this chapter we have seen that Hungarian, like English, has only two "simple" tenses, namely, the present and the past, and one composite form, the periphrastic future, a "syntactic construction" rather than a tense, according to Antal (1966). Whether one cares to label the conditional and the imperative as "tenses" (Antal 1966) or as "moods" (Lotz 1962), one is still confronted with a residue of composite verbal forms in Hungarian which are worthy of brief consideration here. One of these composite forms, namely the conditional perfect, is of paradigmatic significance since it is the regular past-time counterpart of the simple conditional. The other verbal combination, *szoktam* + infinitive, is anomalous on several counts.[5]

17.2.2.1 *The conditional perfect*. As a composite tense, the Hungarian conditional perfect shows several points of contrast with the corresponding form in English. In the first place, the lexical verb is inflected for person while in English it is the auxiliary (or the first verb in a compound auxiliary) which shows the inflection, if, indeed, there is any inflection at all. The auxiliary precedes the main verb in English, while it generally follows in Hungarian. Just as the present conditional in Hungarian is used in both the "contrary-to-fact" conditional clause and the main clause, so also is the perfect conditional used in both clauses. The English equivalents generally require the "subjunctive" and the "conditional," respectively, although, of course, there often is little formal justification for such labelling. Here the translations will serve to indicate what the possible English correspondences might be. Thus, if in a present-time situation a sentence such as a.1 is uttered, then the corresponding past-time utterance would appear as b.1, the English equivalents being as given:

a. 1. Ha ott *lennék*, *megmondanám* neki.
   2. If I *were* there, I *would tell* him.

b. 1. Ha ott *lettem volna*, *megmondtam volna* neki.
   2. If I *had been* there, I *would have told* him.

While the present conditional occurs quite often in optative constructions and polite formulas in Hungarian, the perfect conditional has a more restricted range of uses. Although the latter may indeed be used to express wishes relating to unfulfilled events, it is quite anomalous in constructions meant to be softened requests parallel to the frequent constructions with the present conditional. In fact, the overwhelming uses of the perfect conditional do involve an indication of some unfulfilled action, either in optative or declarative form. Several additional examples may suffice to illustrate this tendency:

c. 1. Bárcsak eljöttél volna te is!
   2. If only you had come along too!

d. 1. Mi lett volna, ha nem láttalak volna
   2. What would have happened if I had not seen you

The English sentences b.2 and d.2 show a simplifying tendency which is reminiscent of the reduction shown by the periphrastic future in if (or when) clauses, namely, like the future, the conditional perfect in English need not be marked in an if clause since the main clause has a marked conditional perfect. This tendency carries over to optative clauses also, where, of course, the main clause is "deleted." The Hungarian counterparts of the two English sentences just mentioned also show an item of intralingual contrast which should be called to the student's attention. This is the fact that the verb van 'is' has its perfect conditional built on the stem le-, and not vol- as is its preterite, all other verbs, of course, forming the perfect conditional from the simple past form (definite or indefinite). Thus, the expected form voltam volna is obsolete.

17.2.2.2 The szoktam + infinitive construction. There is an anomaly in both the present-time and past-time uses of the szoktam construction in Hungarian. To begin with, this verb itself is morphologically a past tense form, but when used with the infinitive alone, it indicates a customary or regularly repeated action.

The English equivalent of this syntactic construction is often the simple present-tense form, with or without such adverbs as *usually*, *generally*, etc.:

a. 1. Szabad időmben *sétálni szoktam*.
   2. In my free time I usually *take* a walk.

b. 1. Nem *szoktunk elkésni*.
   2. We usually *don't come* late.

c. 1. Nem szoktam cigarettázni.
   2. I don't smoke.

In each instance here, the English-speaking student might be tempted to see a close parallel between the *szoktam* construction and the English *used to*. However, as indicated above, the time references do not agree, *szoktam* being used for present-time situations in spite of its past-tense form. To indicate customary action in the past Hungarian often displays another type of anomaly, namely the use of the "remote past" (Hungarian *régmúlt*) of the auxiliary *szoktam*, a tense otherwise obsolete in modern standard Hungarian. This composite form, consisting of the past tense of both the above auxiliary and the pluperfect auxiliary *van*, is quite rare, and according to my informant, occurs most acceptably in final position in a sentence showing comparison. In such instances *used to* is a good equivalent in English:

d. 1. Már nem todok olyan gyorsan futni, mint ahogyan *szoktam volt*.
   2. I can't run as fast as I *used to*.

This type of indication of repeated or customary action leads us to a more detailed consideration of aspect, which now follows.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVII

1. See Bull 1960 for an extensive discussion of this matter.

2. Hall 1959 gives numerous illustrations of how different cultures view time "informally" or personally, and what the nonlinguistic consequences of such views are.

3. The following list of verbs which generally do not occur in the continuous tense, though not complete, may be of interest: *see*, *hear*, *notice*, *recognize*, *smell* (intr.), *taste* (intr.), *remember*, *forget*, *know*, *understand*, *recall*, *recollect*, *believe*, (also *feel*, *think*), *suppose*, *mean*, *gather* ("understand"), *want*, *wish*, *desire*, *refuse*, *forgive*, *care*, *love*, *hate*, *like*, *be fond of*, *be angry*, etc., *adore*, *seem*, *signify*, *appear* ("seem"), *belong to*, *matter*, *possess* (also *have*), *consist of*, *own*, and others. (See Tarján and Korenchy 1965:35.)

4. In generative terms, the (obligatory) change of *van* + *lenni* to *lesz* is a transformation on the same order as the one which requires that *nem* + *van* be changed to *nincs* and the one changing *is* + *nem* to *sem* or *is* (or *se*) + *nincs* to *sincs*.

5. The verb *szokni* may be conjugated for all persons, of course, but for the sake of simplicity here I am using the first person singular form as a symbol for all forms.

CHAPTER XVIII

ASPECT

18.0 Introduction

We have already mentioned, if only briefly, several devices used in Hungarian to mark various aspects. In the case of phrasal verbs, for example, we have shown that 1) the addition of a prefix often shows perfective aspect while the simplex verb shows imperfectiveness, e.g. megenni 'to eat up' vs. enni,'to eat' 2) postposition of the prefix often indicates imperfectiveness vs. the perfectiveness of the preposed position: Hazament, 'He went home.' vs. Ment haza, 'He was on the way home.' and 3) reduplication of the prefix indicates the frequentative aspect: Vissza-visszatekintett, 'He kept glancing back.' We have also indicated that there is a productive suffix employed to give frequentative meaning to verbs or to form frequentative verbs out of nouns or adjectives. The example given above was ostobáskodik 'he's acting silly' from ostoba 'stupid, silly.' The truth of the matter is that there are numerous, more or less productive suffixes in Hungarian which may be used to give aspectual nuances to some verbs. These formative suffixes will be considered to be lexical items here which can be gotten from one of the more complete grammars of Hungarian.[1] What is of more immediate concern for a contrastive analysis such as this are the syntactic devices used in English and Hungarian for indicating the state of completion of an action or the relative time of one event compared to another. These are not readily convertible to lists in dictionaries or glossaries. As is well known, the favored device in English for indicating imperfect aspect is the use of the continuous (or "progressive") tenses, while Hungarian uses various time-adverbials to make the same sort of differentiation. We have already seen numerous examples of these given without much elaboration. Now follows the necessary elaboration.

18.1 The continuous tenses in English

The English tenses we will be dealing with in this section can be illustrated as follows: is writing, was writing, has been writing, had been writing, will be writing, and will have been writing. These will be referred to as the present continuous, past continuous, etc. We have already discussed the first of these briefly in our treatment of the present tense and the periphrastic future in Hungarian and have indicated that the present continuous in English generally requires a present-tense form in Hungarian unless reference is made to a future event, in which case the periphrastic future is occasionally used in the Hungarian equivalent. We have also indicated that the continuous tense in English shows an intralingual contrast with the simple present tense since the latter may denote a permanent characteristic, while the former shows a transitory state: are being silly vs. are silly, for example. It is our intention at this point to further relate the continuous tenses to matters of relative time and, primarily by translation, to indicate what devices may be used to convey the same sort of distinctions in Hungarian, when such distinctions are felt to be necessary.

18.1.1 Present-time relations as expressed by the continuous tenses. The most characteristic feature of the continuous tenses is their dependent, that is to say, their context-bound nature. They characteristically relate the time of an on-going activity to some other time, either explicitly expressed in the discourse, or implicit in the discourse situation. This means, among other things, that the past continuous cannot acceptably be the only tense form in a sentence intended as the sole utterance in a discourse, while the simple past tense can serve this function. Thus a.1 below seems deficient as a discourse; there seems to be more information needed. After hearing a.1, one is inclined to ask, "Well, what happened?" while a.2 is complete as it stands:

a. 1. I was writing a letter to my aunt yesterday.
vs. 2. I wrote a letter to my aunt yesterday.

Unless otherwise marked, the present continuous tense relates to a non-habitual or non-characteristic, on-going event with an implied time-limit, in contrast to the repetition or open-endedness of an action expressed in the simple present tense. It is in this way that we can contrast is being silly (now) with is (always/usually/generally) silly. Further examples are given in the following sentences, the translations of which indicate that differing verbs can be used in Hungarian to achieve the same sort of contras shown by the different verb forms in English:

b. 1. He's living in Paris. (temporarily, or at least
2. Párizsban él. now as opposed to the past

vs. c. 1. He lives in Paris. (permanent home, no time limit
2. Párizsban lakik.

The time relationship implicit in the present continuous tense may of course, be reinforced by the use of such adverbs as now or nowadays, etc., and the time-limit may likewise be stated: "He's living in Paris for the time being." Thus, b.1 implies prior knowledge of the subject's former residence, while c.1 does not. Likewise d.1 below would generally be asked if the interlocutor has some prior knowledge relating to the addressee's former occupation otherwise e.1 would more likely be the question:

d. 1. What are you doing for a living? (i.e., "these days")
2. Mi a jelenlegi foglalkozásod? ('present occupation')

e. 1. What do you do for a living?
2. Mi a foglalkozásod?

In fact, unless said to a fairly close friend, a question such as d.1 could be impolite, while its Hungarian translation shows another common means of indicating the same time relationship inherent in the English present continuous tense. As indicated previously, another common way of indicating various temporal relationships in Hungarian, where tense differentiations are lacking, is through the use of various adverbials, including identical nouns with contrasting relational suffixes:

f. 1. He's living with his uncle.
2. A nagybátyjánál lakik. (cf. German bei)

g. 1. He lives with his uncle.
2. A nagybátyjával lakik. (cf. German mit)

Inquiring about the duration of such an activity as indicated by the continuous tense in the English examples immediately above requires that the verbs be put in corresponding perfect forms while the present tense still holds for the Hungarian:

h. 1. How long has he been living with his uncle?
2. Mióta lakik a nagybátyjánál?

i. 1. How long has he lived with his uncle?
2. Mióta lakik a nagybátyjával?

although, of course, declarative sentences can also be found in which the perfect tenses are contrasted as to the continuous vs. the non-continuous nature of the activity they denote. Employing, of course, a verb which ordinarily may occur in the continuous tense, we can have, for example:

j. 1. I've been writing letters all afternoon. (and still am.)
vs. 2. I've written six letters this afternoon. (and may write more.)
and 3. I wrote six letters this afternoon. (I'm finished.)

Since have been writing denotes an on-going activity, the present tense is used in the equivalent in Hungarian, while the remaining two examples contain verbs which depict past-time activities, and call for past-tense equivalents in Hungarian, the adverb már being employed to indicate the open-endedness of the activity as marked by the form of the verb in j.2: "Már hat levelet írtam ma délután."

18.1.2 Past-time relations as expressed by continuous tenses. The past continuous tense in English has often been compared to the imperfect tenses of the Romance languages. It provides the "background" for another action, that is, it indicates an activity in progress at the time another activity is fulfilled. Since both activities are depicted as having been completed, the Hungarian equivalents generally call for the simple present tense with adverbials supplying the necessary distinctions in time. It can be seen that the use of the past continuous tense does not require that the accompanying past action be overtly present in the same utterance. The proper time relationship may be indicated by the use of a temporal adverbial, or just may be gotten from the discourse situation itself. The following sentences, for example, imply a prior context for the proper identification of such definite nominals as he, and the table, in addition to the "definite time adverbial" at that time:

a. 1. He was travelling in Italy at that time.
2. Abban az időben (éppen) Olaszországban utazott.

b. 1. An Italian *was sitting* on the other side of the table.
2. Az asztal másik felén egy olasz *ült*.

More often than not, however, the past continuous form is accompanied by the simple past-tense form of the other verb used in correlation with it:

c. 1. We *were eating* when our friend stepped in.
2. Éppen *ebédeltünk*, amikor a barátunk belépett.

d. 1. I *was studying* when the telephone rang.
2. Éppen *tanultam*, amikor a telefon csengett.

As shown in the examples, the Hungarian past tense forms are often reinforced by the adverb *éppen*, a close equivalent of the English *just*, which is used to indicate nearness of a past-time event. Coterminous events may also be indicated by the use of the past continuous tense for all verbs involved, the imperfectiveness of both actions being placed in the foreground:

e. 1. While I *was studying*, Steve *was writing* letters.
2. Miallat *tanultam*, Pista leveleket írt.

These verb forms, of course, still require contextual indications of the relative times of their fulfillment. Stressing the duration of the "background" activity in English calls for the use of the perfect tense, in this case the past perfect continuous. The Hungarian equivalent as usual expresses the on-going nature of the imperfective activity by the time adverbial in -*ja* and the time relationship by the almost ubiquitous *már*, the verb being in the simple past:

f. 1. I *had been working* for five hours when he came.
2. Már öt órája dolgoztam, amikor megjött.

Questioning the extent of time already involved in the on-going activity can be in the form of a yes-no question or interrogative-word construction, in which case either one or the other of the familiar adverbial elements in the Hungarian are replaced:

g. 1. How long had you been living in Paris when you first met her?
2. Mennyi ideje laktál Párizsban, amikor először találkoztál vele?

h. 1. Had you been waiting for him for long when he arrived?
2. Régóta vártál már rá, amikor megérkezett?

Needless to say, the fact that some verbs in English tend to be incompatible with a continuous-tense form holds also for the perfect continuous tenses. Compare i.1 with f.1:

i. 1. I had been ill six days when he arrived. (*had been being)
2. Már hat napja beteg voltam, amikor megérkezett.

Removing the imperfective element from the verb designating the activity more remote in time naturally involves change from the continuous to the past perfect tense for even those verbs which can and usually do occur in the former form. This may occur with or without the employment of already to reinforce the notion of completeness, while the Hungarian equivalent may use the accusative instead of the -ja suffix on the time element:

j. 1. I had (already) worked five hours before he arrived.
2. Már öt órát ledolgoztam, mielőtt megérkezett.

With the use of temporal conjunctions as before and after the time relationships otherwise expressed by the use of the past perfect tenses are often considered redundant. Accordingly one can find the simple past used in place of the past perfect in English, thereby making a very close parallel with the use of the Hungarian simple past. Sentence j.1 then could have worked instead of had worked, the Hungarian equivalent remaining the same. Another example of this tendency is the following:

k. 1. After I had read the book, I went for a walk.
or 2. After I read the book, I went for a walk.
3. Miután elolvastam a könyvet, elmentem sétálni.

18.1.3 *The continuous tenses to express future time.* In the preceding chapter we gave several examples of the use of the present continuous tense to express future action, and that a very common form used to express immediate futurity is the continuous tense of *go* employed as an auxiliary. Thus, we may have:

a. 1. I'm leaving for Vienna tomorrow.
or 2. I'm going to leave for Vienna tomorrow.

both of which have the simple present tense in their Hungarian equivalents. However, to stress the continuousness of the activity, either of the activity itself or in relation to another non-durative activity, speakers have recourse to the future continuous tenses in English. The Hungarian translations show either the present or the periphrastic future with apparently a preference for the simple present:

b. 1. Tomorrow at this time we'*ll be nearing* France.
2. Holnap ilyenkor már Franciaország felé közeledünk.

c. 1. I'*ll* (still) *be working* when you get back.
2. Én még mindig *dolgozni fogok*, amikor hazajössz.

The second clause in c.2 above illustrates once again a feature of the use of the composite future in English, namely that after *if*- or *when*-clauses the present form is used instead of the future. This holds for the future continuous also. The following example shows a reduction of the future continuous after *if* and a reduction of the periphrastic future after *when*, while the future is retained in the main clause. It can be noted that the equivalents in Hungarian may all be in the present tense:

d. 1. If you *are* still *working* when I *come* back, I'*ll write* some letters.
2. Ha még mindig *dolgozol*, amikor majd *hazajövök*, *megírok* néhány levelet.

The same time relationships that we have discussed in regard to the use of the perfect tenses in the present and past in English are applicable for the future also. The activity denoted by the future continuous verb in c.1 above, for example, may be viewed in its extension or duration, in which case the future perfect continuous is used, while the Hungarian counterpart occurs in the present with the time adverbial in -ja:

e. 1. I will have been working five hours when you get back.
2. Már öt órája dolgozom, amikor visszajössz.

f. 1. At six o'clock tomorrow morning I will have been sleeping for seven hours.
2. Holnap reggel hat órakor lesz, hogy hét órája alszom.

Describing an activity which is less durative than working or sleeping may require the non-continuous future perfect, the Hungarian translation still showing the use of the present tense:

g. 1. Next year at this time George will have gotten his degree.
2. Már jövő ilyenkorra Györgynek meglesz a diplomája.

18.2 Sequence of tenses

As indicated in the previous section, the matter of aspect in English is almost inextricably interwoven with considerations of time, particularly time relative to the time of another event in the discourse. It might be profitable to summarize at this point what we have indicated to be important from the standpoint of the English tenses, even though from a contrastive point of view the paucity of tense forms in Hungarian may make interference problems less troublesome for English-speaking students, who have only a present or past tense to choose from.

18.2.1 Time indications of English tenses. Both English and Hungarian may view an activity from either of two time references, namely the actual time of the speech act, or the time of an event mentioned in the discourse. It is abundantly clear that, generally speaking, English makes many more time distinctions by means of tense-form alone and that Hungarian often can make the same sorts of distinctions through a wide variety of adverbials, whenever this is felt to be necessary. It goes without saying, moreover, that even though the two languages do employ the same two time references, broadly speaking, there is not always complete agreement between the two languages as to whether a given situation should be viewed from the point of view of one time or the other. This will be illustrated further below after we have reviewed the sequence of tenses. If we view events, first of all, considered from the time of the speech act itself, we get several interlingual contrasts in addition to quite a few instances of correspondence. Viewing the time of one event in relation to the time of another event shows still other contrasts. Thus, in the first category we have at least the following possibilities:

Activities viewed from the time of the speech act

Description	English	Hungarian
"timeless" events	present	present
habitually repeated events	present (interrogative, negative or emphatic forms with do)	present (or szoktam)
begun in past, open-ended	present perfect	present
same with emphasis on on-going nature of activity	present perfect continuous	present
on-going without reference to inception	present continuous	present
dramatic narration of completed events	present or past	present or past
completed event, effect still immediate	present perfect	present

Description	English	Hungarian
narration of completed events	past	past
repeated or habitual past events	past (used to/would)	past (szoktam volt)
future events, either immediate or with time stated	present, present continuous, (going to)	present
future events less immediate than above	future, (going to)	future or present

Activities viewed in relation to another activity

Description	English	Hungarian
past event on-going in relation to another event	past continuous	past
past event anterior to another completed event	past perfect	past
past event begun before subsequent event, duration stressed	past perfect continuous	past
future event, durative with respect to other event	future continuous	present or future
future event, completed with respect to other event	future perfect	present
future event, initiated prior to other event, duration stressed	future perfect continuous	present

Setting aside the levelling of tenses that we have noticed occurring in time clauses in English, as well as the anomalies of tense in indirect speech to be discussed below, we might have the following partial paradigm if we were to select a verb compatible with the continuous aspect:

Tense label	English	Hungarian
present	works	dolgozik
present continuous	is working	dolgozik
present perfect continuous	has been working	dolgozik

Tense label	English	Hungarian
past	worked	dolgozott
present perfect	has worked	dolgozott
past continuous	was working	dolgozott
past perfect	had worked	dolgozott
past perfect continuous	had been working	dolgozott
future	will work (is going to work or works)	dolgozni fog (dolgozik)
future continuous	will be working	dolgozni fog (dolgozik)
future perfect	will have worked	dolgozott (dolgozik)
future perfect continuous	will have been working	dolgozott (dolgozik)

In addition to the list of mismatches in tense given above, one has to bear in mind that the dramatic present ("historical present") is used much more often in Hungarian than in English, and that the present tense in Hungarian often serves to indicate future time as expressed by the periphrastic future in English. Moreover, the sequence of tenses followed in indirect speech deviates from even the elementary scheme outlined above, and as a consequence deserves further discussion here.

18.2.2 Sequence of tenses in indirect speech. We have already indicated in 17.1.1.1 that in reported speech the present-tense form in Hungarian may be used to designate an activity which is actually completed. This is so because the reported event is viewed not from the time of the reporting speech act, but from the time of the first speech event at which time the reported event was still on-going. In English, on the other hand, we can find past tense forms used in indirect speech to designate activities or states which are still on-going. In fact, in reported speech in Hungarian one can find past, present, and future forms used to refer to events which, viewed from the time of the reporting speech event, are completely fulfilled, while English may in comparable situations use the past tense to refer to events which, viewed from the time of the reporting, may be past, on-going, or yet to be fulfilled.[2] The latter phenomenon is possible because English speakers have the convention of adjusting the tense form of the reported event to the form of the verb of reporting. Only a verb of reporting in the present tense would be followed by a non-past form when referring to an on-going event. If the event being reported is over, or if the reporting verb has a form which is morphologically past, then a past tense form follows. Illustrating this with perhaps the commonest verb of reporting, say, and its Hungarian equivalent mondani, we can list the following examples as being typical:

	Direct quotation	Reported speech
a. 1.	"John is sick."	He says John is sick.
2.	"János beteg."	Azt mondja, hogy János beteg.
b. 1.	"John is sick." (now)	He (just) said John was sick.
2.	"János beteg."	(Eppen) azt mondta, hogy János beteg.
c. 1.	"John is sick." (yesterday)	He said John was sick.
2.	"János beteg."	Azt mondta, hogy János beteg.
d. 1.	"John was sick."	He says John was sick.
2.	"János beteg volt."	Azt mondja, hogy János beteg volt.
e. 1.	"John was sick."	He said John had been sick. (also was)
2.	"János beteg volt."	Azt mondta, hogy János beteg volt.
f. 1.	"John is sitting on the floor."	He said John was sitting on the floor.
2.	"János a padlón ül."	Azt mondta, hogy János a padlón ül.
g. 1.	"John has been sitting on the floor for four hours." (either now or past)	He said that John had been sitting on the floor for four hours. (also has been sitting)
2.	"János már négy órája a padlón ül."	Azt mondta, hogy János már négy órája a padlón ül.

h. 1.	"John *will be* here tomorrow."	He said John *would be* here tomorrow.
2.	"János holnap itt *lesz*."	Azt mondta, hogy holnap itt *lesz* János.
i. 1.	"John *will arrive* tomorrow."	He said John *would arrive* tomorrow.
2.	"János holnap *megérkezik*."	Azt mondta, hogy holnap János *megérkezik*.
j. 1.	"John *is arriving* tomorrow."	He said John *was arriving* tomorrow.
2.	"János holnap *érkezik meg*."	Azt mondta, hogy János holnap *érkezik meg*.
k. 1.	"What *is* her name?"	He asked what her name *was*.
2.	"Mi a *neve*?"	Azt kérdezte, hogy mi a *neve*.
l. 1.	"Her name *is* Mary."	He said her name *was* Mary.
2.	"Mária a *neve*."	Azt mondta, hogy *Mária* a neve.
m. 1.	"What *is* she *going to do* tomorrow?"	I wish I knew what she *was going to do* tomorrow.
2.	"*Mit fog csinálni* holnap?"	*Bárcsak* tudnám, hogy holnap mit *fog csinálni*.

The tendency in English, as can be seen from the above examples, is to move the tense of the reported verb one "step" back in time; present becomes past, past becomes past perfect, etc. However, in actual practice some of the steps may not be followed at all levels of standard usage. More details in this regard cannot be given here. However, I feel that enough examples have been presented to show that Hungarian consistently regards the time of the original event as being the more crucial, not the time of the reporting speech event. English speakers are attracted by the *form* of the verb of reporting, a "subjunctive" form which appears morphologically as a past tense form also influencing the choice of a non-past form, as in m.1, even though the event is to be completed in the future. It must be noted also that the English periphrastic future has a shifted form in *would*.

18.3 Statal passive

Although voice as such has very little to do with aspect, there is good reason for discussing the Hungarian statal passive at this point in our study, for it may be easily confused with the "real passive" of English, rather than the corresponding statal passive. Since the passive voice is no longer a part of the conjugational system of Hungarian, such confusion could have detrimental effects on the ability of an English-speaking student to communicate in Hungarian.

18.3.1 Statal passive vs. real passive. The statal passive in English may have the identical verbal form as the real passive. However, the statal passive is perfective in some sense since it indicates the result of some previous action. If we consider the widespread use of the passive voice in English as a device to focus attention on the object, rather than the subject of an action, i.e., to make a topic out of what otherwise would be part of the comment, we can more readily arrive at suitable Hungarian constructions that achieve the same effect. In a few instances statal passives have a different second element than their real passive counterparts, in which case less interference is to be expected. But consider the following:

a. 1. The door is closed at six.
   2. The door is closed (now).

The first of these sentences refers to a regularly-occurring event, while the second refers to a state, the result of a previous action. Only the first of these may be expanded by an agentive phrase introduced by by, or converted to show the continuous aspect, is being closed. Since the effect of a.1 is to focus attention on the object while ignoring the actor, the most suitable

Hungarian translation would have the object in initial position, with the third person plural "general" subject being used, the latter being also possible in English:

b. 1. Az ajtót hat órakor zárják (be).
2. They close the doors at six.

Needless to say, Hungarian may use other types of constructions to achieve the same sort of effect achieved by the use of the real passive in English. Several examples may suffice to illustrate this:

c. 1. The house is being painted.
2. A ház festés alatt áll. (lit., "stands under painting" cf. under construction)

d. 1. The house is being built.
2. A ház építés alatt áll.

18.3.2 Statal passive constructions compared. After the very brief sketch of the real passive in English and some Hungarian semantic equivalents, we may now profitably compare the statal passives in the two languages to see how their superficial syntactic similarities can be the cause of considerable interference for the English-speaking student learning to speak Hungarian. Both constructions under discussion here are composite forms, the English auxiliary being a form of be, while the Hungarian auxiliary is a form of van. The second form in each construction is a non-finite one, the past participle in English, the present gerund in Hungarian. However, since the statal passive characteristically depicts the resultant state of some perfective action, the gerund is quite often built on a verb stem appearing with a perfective prefix in Hungarian, in which case the statal passive occurs in three parts, the auxiliary occurring between the prefix and the verb. Some typical examples of statal passives are:

a. 1. The door *is closed*.
2. Az ajtó *be van zárva*. (or *zárva van*)

b. 1. The window *is open*.
2. Az ablak *nyitva van*.

c. 1. The house *is painted*.
2. *Be van festve* a ház.

d. 1. I'*m satisfied*.
2. *Meg vagyok elégedve*.

Note the reduced form of *opened* which is used in the statal passive in English, and also the pre-positioning of the predicate for emphasis in c.2. The crucial thing for the student to remember here, however, is that if a verb form such as *is closed* occurs without an agent or an adverbial indicating a reoccurring event, then the composite form denotes a state and may be translated by the statal passive in Hungarian. If, on the other hand, such a verb indicates a repeated event, we are dealing with a real passive, which must be translated into Hungarian by the active voice, either with the "general" third-person plural subject if the English counterpart contains no expressed agent, or with the "agent" as subject.

18.3.3 "*Reflexive verbs*" *vs. passives in Hungarian*. It must be mentioned at this point that Hungarian has formative suffixes which can be used to form "reflexive verbs" which on the surface resemble passive verbs semantically since they permit nouns which generally occur as objects of the simplex verbs to appear as subjects of the resulting intransitive verbs. In several instances the English equivalent may be the same for both the original and derived verb:

a. 1. Siessünk, már *kezdik* az előadást. (Bánhidi et al. 1965:341)
2. Let's hurry; the performance *is starting* already. ('they are starting')

b. 1. Siessünk, már kezdődik az előadás.
2. Let's hurry; the performance is starting already.

Although the -ódik suffix is productive, its use is so varied that the student should be cautioned against attempting to match all continuous intransitive verbs in English with an equivalent Hungarian verb formed with this suffix, even though such verbs as csukódik 'is closing,' i.e., 'is being closed,' do occur.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVIII

1. See, for example, Tompa 1968:104ff.

2. As used here, "verb of reporting" is meant to include also those verbs which we have earlier designated "mental state verbs." These include such verbs as think, consider, know, and the like, which could take a clause object--with or without a conjunction--capable of being formed from a complete sentence, i.e., a "direct quotation."

CHAPTER XIX

THE CATEGORY OF NUMBER

19.0 Introduction

The category of number occurs as an obligatory category in the grammar of both English and Hungarian. This means that there are mandatory structural correlates associated with the semantic classification of, for example, "one" vs. "more than one." Other sorts of classification along these lines are also possible, of course, but they need not concern us here since the two number classes just mentioned are sufficient for discussing the phenomenon of number in English and Hungarian.

19.1 Pluralization

It is clear that the most obvious place for an English-speaking student to look for structural manifestations of the notion of number in Hungarian would be in the marking of the noun for plurality since this is the area where number is most noticeable in the grammar of English. However, while it is true that Hungarian, like English, does mark nouns with a special morpheme to indicate plurality, the plural morpheme in Hungarian is used with much less frequency than its English counterpart. That is to say, the Hungarian noun itself is not marked for plurality as often as the English noun is. With regard to countable noun phrases, on the other hand, the plural morpheme may occur in one form or other in Hungarian in all but a few cases.

19.1.1 Non-possessive nominals. Generally speaking, a noun phrase in both English and Hungarian is marked only once for plural. Thus, we have:

house	houses	the house	the houses	the pretty house(s)
ház	házak	a ház	a házak	a csinos ház(ak)

If, on the other hand, the noun phrase contains a quantifier of any kind, then there is a contrast. In Hungarian the quantifier is sufficient to serve as the marker of plurality, while in English the noun is still marked for plural except in a few cases. The following list is illustrative:

egy	ház	one	house	
két	ház	two	houses	
tíz	ház	ten	houses	
néhány	ház	several	houses	
több	ház	some	houses	(also: *more houses*)
sok	ház	many	houses	
számos	ház	numerous	houses	
hány	ház	how many	houses	
annyi	ház	so many	houses	
kevés	ház	(a) few	houses	
minden	ház	all	houses	(also: *every house*)

While all numerals in Hungarian pattern as above, there are several determiner-like adjectives formed from numerals which pattern as ordinary adjectives, and not as quantifiers. The most common of these is *egyes*: *egyes házak* 'some houses' = 'certain houses'; also: *minden egyes ház* 'every single house.' However, the true quantifiers always govern the singular noun, regardless of the actual number they designate. In addition to the ones listed above, the following might be noted: *számtalan ház* 'innumerable houses' and *rengeteg ház* 'an enormous number of houses.' An English parallel which might come to mind here is the use of the same form to refer to one or more animals, game animals in particular. However, this parallelism is only partial at best, for this type of usage is limited in English to the names of a relatively few entities, while the Hungarian pattern includes all nouns, regardless of the class to which they belong. Moreover, as we shall note below, while the English pattern resembles a singular morphologically, it still patterns as a plural. The Hungarian patterns, on the other hand, always behave as singulars. Thus, in English we have "One sheep is ..." and "Two sheep are ..." and "One deer is ..." and "Two deer are ..." However, we also have "Two goats are ..." and "Two elephants are ..." and the like. If any meaningful generalization can be made in this regard for the English usage, it might be to the effect that names of fish tend to have unchanged plurals, and names of birds take the plural form, while some of the larger game animals are referred to with the unchanged plural, and others with the marked plural. For my own usage, the following sample list holds; for other speakers, different groupings:

two sheep
two moose
two grouse
two bass
two pike
two perch
two salmon, etc.

two fish(es)
two buffalo(es)
two pheasant(s)

two sharks
two monkeys
two geese
two ducks
two crows
two hawks
two rabbits, etc.

After a certain point, as already evidenced by the above list, the choice as to which category a certain name might belong to is an individual matter, dependent on the personal experiences of the speaker, and can hardly be further specified linguistically. To repeat, the Hungarian pattern is a grammatical phenomenon embracing all nouns.

19.1.1.1 Plural determiners. It can be seen from the above, then, that the only simple determiners in Hungarian which may collocate with the plural noun are the definite article and Ø. However, the demonstrative pronoun, when used with the definite article to form a demonstrative determiner, does agree with its associated noun in number (and case), which, in turn, brings up a special feature of English grammar, for a rare instance of an adjective or determiner of any kind being inflected in English occurs with the use of the demonstratives. These agree in number with the noun they modify. Hungarian, on the other hand, has two possible demonstrative determiner patterns as equivalents, one of which shows the same agreement in number as the English, while the other (much less common) does not:

this house	ez a ház
these houses	ezek a házak (or: _e házak_)
that house	az a ház
those houses	azok a házak (or: _a házak_)

19.1.2 _Possessive nouns._ In Chapter XI we discussed possessive constructions from the point of view of their definiteness. These constructions will now be considered in regard to their behavior when variously marked for number. As can be noted from the many examples of possessive constructions occurring in this study, there is a separate morpheme employed to mark plurality in possessives, namely -_i_. Thus, the non-possessive and possessive plurals of _ház_ may be compared as follows, only the third person form being given for the time being:

a ház	a házak	a háza	a házai
the house	the houses	his house	his houses

In the third person plural both plural morphemes may occur on the same noun, one to indicate the plurality of the possessor, i.e., -_k_, the other the plurality of the possessed:

a házuk	a házaik
their house	their houses

However, when the possessor noun occurs as part of the possessive construction in its usual preposed position, then the second plural marker is deleted:

a tanárok háza__	a tanárok házai__
the teachers' house	the teachers' houses

This holds even if the plural morpheme on the modifying noun is the possessive plural -*i*:

a tanáraim háza	a tanáraim házai
my teachers' house	my teachers' houses

If, on the other hand, the possessor is emphasized by the employment of the personal pronouns in front of the possessed noun, then the first plural morpheme is deleted. Compare:

	én I	az én házam my house	az én házaim my houses
	ő he	az ő háza his house	az ő házai his houses
	mi we	a mi házunk our house	a mi házaink, etc. our houses
but:	ők they	az ő házuk their house	az ő házaik their houses

These possessive relationships may be made even more emphatic by the addition of the adjective *saját* 'own':

a(z én) saját házam	a (mi) saját házunk, etc.
my own house	our own house

This adjective has a semantic equivalent in the word *maga*, which ought to be mentioned at this point because of its divergent syntactic behavior. By "divergent" here I mean "divergent from the behavior of adjectives in general," for morphologically and syntactically *maga* is a noun. It is itself marked with the possessive suffixes, and the noun it governs shows the ending of a third-person possessor. Comparing the two emphatic constructions, we may have:

	a saját házam	a saját házunk	a saját házuk
or:	a magam háza	a magunk háza	a maguk háza
	my own house	our own house	their own house

The "switch" here is not strictly one of number, but rather of person, the practice of marking the possessor only once in the *maga* construction being parallel to the tendency to mark the plural only once in other possessive patterns.

19.1.2.1 Semantic interpretation of plural possessives. In addition to the obvious morphological contrasts between the English and Hungarian possessive constructions shown above, there may also be contrasts in the semantic interpretation of the possessives in regard to number if there is a plural morpheme somewhere in the construction. Thus the glosses given above for a házuk 'their house' should properly read 'their house(s)' since the Hungarian construction could refer to more than one house, each person involved being the owner of one house. Unless a communally owned (or lived in) house is meant, a házuk would ordinarily be translated into English as 'their houses,' since English looks at the aggregate of "possessed" entities, even in those instances where nature normally provides only one such entity per person, or where the prevailing cultural standards impose such a distribution. At times such use of the aggregate plural can be a source of humor even among native speakers of English:

a. 1. The pupils shook their heads.
   2. The teachers arrived with their wives.

In spite of the marking for plural, we normally assume that one of each entity is meant, while Hungarian (and German, Spanish, French, etc.) does not mark the possessed noun for plural for the very same reason. Thus, from the English point of view we may have two reductions in number occurring at the same time: 1) the plurality of the possessor is not indicated when the third-person plural possessor noun is juxtaposed with its possessed noun, and 2) the plurality of the possessed is left unmarked if it can be assumed that a distribution of one each is meant. Compare:

	a tanár háza	the teacher's house
	a tanárok háza	the teachers' house
with:	a tanár felesége	the teacher's wife
	a tanárok felesége	the teachers' wives

It must be remarked, however, that the last construction is always open to the polygamous interpretation, and that, moreover, there seems to be a tendency toward the aggregate plural since the use of the plural possessed is also found to occur without the polygamous interpretation. Therefore a tanárok feleségei 'the teachers' wives',' which parallels the English in regard to marking for number, is also heard as an alternate for the latter noun phrase. In addition to this, it must be remembered that in non-contiguous position, the plural possessor marker occurs on the possessed noun even though the possessor is overtly marked for plural. Compare the last-given noun phrase with the possessive construction in the following sentence:

b. 1. A tanároknak szép feleségeik vannak.
2. The teachers have pretty wives.

which does occur as an alternate for:

c. 1. A tanároknak szép felesége van.
2. The teachers have pretty wives.

The favored construction does have the singular marker, however. See below for further contrasts in number between English and Hungarian nouns of certain semantic areas.

19.2 Agreement in number

Broadly speaking, one agreement rule can be given to cover practically all cases of number agreement in both English and Hungarian, namely, "the predicate of a clause agrees with its subject in number." However, there are a considerable number of contrasts, both intra- and interlingual, in the ways in which this rule is applied.

19.2.1 Agreement of verbal predicate. While verbs generally agree in number with the subject, it becomes necessary to consider two types of number, actual or real-world number, and grammatical number, for there are many instances where more than one entity is being referred to by the use of singular grammatical forms, and, vice versa, plural forms being used in instances where only one entity is meant. The second-person personal pronoun in English is a prime example of the latter tendency, since you generally remains the same whether referring to one or more persons, although, as previously mentioned, some speakers do mark this form when more than one person is meant: you all, y'all, etc. Hungarian, on the other hand, has three plural forms to match the three singular forms, which we have discussed extensively in Chapter VI. Thus, the singulars te, ön, and maga have ti, önök, and maguk as their counterparts in the plural. However, these are actually contrasts involving person as well as number, since, as we have seen, te and ön require different person agreement in spite of their singular number. There are many other interlingual contrasts, however, which involve number. These stem for the most part from the fact that Hungarian nouns following a quantifier are grammatically singular within their own clause, but are semantically plural as evidenced by number agreement in subsequent parts of the discourse. The parallel which we cited to show that in some areas unmarked plural forms occur in English also was only partially valid, for in spite of the unchanged noun in two sheep, this form is grammatically plural as indicated by agreement: Two sheep are ... In Hungarian, on the other hand, a noun phrase such as két ház 'two houses' has the same verbal agreement as egy ház 'one house':

a. 1.	Egy ház *áll*.	One house *is standing*.
2.	Két ház *áll*.	Two houses *are standing*.
3.	Tíz ház *áll*.	Ten houses *are standing*.
4.	Sok ház *áll*. etc.	Many houses *are standing*. etc.

Further departure from the English pattern occurs when two such subjects in Hungarian are conjoined with the co-ordinating conjunction *és* (or *meg*) 'and.'

19.2.1.1 *Agreement with conjoined subjects*. While mathematically one plus one equals more than one in Hungarian, grammatically this may not be the case. Two singular subjects conjoined by *és* 'and' generally govern a verb in the singular:

a. 1. Egy férfi és egy asszony *áll* a sarkon. (sg.)
2. A man and a woman *are standing* on the corner.

This holds, of course, even when the subjects are "semantically" plural but grammatically singular:

b. 1. Két férfi és négy asszony *áll* a sarkon. (sg.)
2. Two men and four women *are standing* on the corner.

That this type of agreement is purely a grammatical matter and not a case of different *Weltanschauung*, or anything of that nature, is evidenced by the fact that in subsequent discourse such "singular" subjects are referred to in the plural:

c. 1. Két férfi és négy asszony áll a sarkon.
Villamosra vár*nak*. (pl.)
2. Two men and four women are standing on the corner.
They are waiting for a streetcar.

It would be comforting for the beginning student of Hungarian to be told some rule to the effect that if two such conjoined singular subjects in Hungarian are felt to be a close-knit unit, then the singular verb is employed: if not, then the plural form of the verb is used. Unfortunately, no such rule can be given, for in c.1, for example, no unity seems to be felt in regard to the subjects, even though the verb is in the singular. In other situations, however, a native speaker may detect a semantic difference in the singular vs. plural verb form used after conjoined singular subjects. Note the English translations for a reflection of this difference:

d. 1. A férfi és a nő olvas. (sg.)
   2. The man and the woman are reading (together).

vs. e. 1. A férfi és a nő olvasnak. (pl.)
   2. The man and the woman are reading. (individually)

The question as to what activities can be viewed as being done in unison or individually is still open and requires more research with more examples tested by several informants before further elaboration can be given.

19.2.2 Agreement of predicate adjectives and nouns. From the Hungarian point of view it is unnecessary to segment predicates into verbal and non-verbal predicates of any kind since in Hungarian all predicates agree with their subjects in number. In English, on the other hand, while verbal predicates and predicate nouns agree in number with their subjects, predicate adjectives do not. We shall examine the adjective constructions first.

19.2.2.1 Predicate adjectives. In Hungarian, unlike English (and German), predicate adjectives agree in number with their subjects. When the subject is clearly marked for plural, then the predicate adjective is consistently marked for plural also. However, just as is the case with verbal predicates, there is vacillation between the singular and plural when there are singular subjects connected by a co-ordinating conjunction. "Clearly marked" plural subjects include those with the plural morpheme -k, with or without the reinforcement of the plural demonstrative:

a. 1. A falak zöldek.
2. The walls are green.

b. 1. Ezek a tornyok magasak.
2. These towers are high.

It ought to be mentioned at this point that Hungarian agrees with English and contrasts with German in the fact that preposed adjectives are not inflected. Thus noun phrases formed from the above two sentences would be as follows:

c. 1. a zöld_ falak
2. the green walls

d. 1. a magas_ tornyok
2. the high towers

and, of course, would require plural agreement themselves when used as subjects in turn:

e. 1. A zöld_ falak régiek.
2. The green walls are old.

It might also be useful at this point to remind the reader of what was briefly discussed in 18.3 above, namely, that there is a construction in Hungarian which resembles the copula-predicate noun construction, though differing from it in several ways. This is the "statal passive" construction formed with the copula (excluding the zero copula) plus the present gerund, which is uninflected. Compare the following:

f. 1. Az ablakok nagyok voltak. The windows were large.
2. Az ablakok nyitva voltak. The windows were open.

In the present tense, of course, zero copula is used in the adjective construction while van is required with the present gerund:

g. 1. Az ablakok nagyok. The windows are large.
2. Az ablakok nyitva vannak. The windows are open.

Conjoined singular subjects may have either singular or plural agreement. Plural agreement is consistent with first or second person plural connected subjects, while third person subjects may be found with either:

h. 1. Te és én fiatalak vagyunk.
2. You and I are young.

but: i. 1. Anna és Kati csinosok.
or 2. Anna és Kati csinos.
3. Ann and Kate are pretty.

There seems to be a tendency, however, to have plural agreement with conjoined proper nouns, as will be further illustrated in the next section. One more example may be given here showing plural agreement after singular agreement with conjoined nouns:

j. 1. Két francia nő volt itt, ők csinosak voltak.
2. Two French women were here. They were pretty.

19.2.2.2 Predicate nouns. In general, predicate nouns agree with their subject nouns in number in both English and Hungarian. However, the same type of vacillation in the Hungarian usage is found in the case of conjoined subjects in the third person. While again no fast rules can be formulated in this regard, there is a tendency to follow two or more proper nouns by plural predicate nominatives, as mentioned above. Thus we may have the following contrast in number:

a. 1. Mária és Anna tanulók. Mary and Anne are pupils.
but: 2. A fiú és a leány tanuló. The boy and (the) girl are pupils.

Again, the same sort of compounding of subject which would call for a first person plural verb would also call for a plural predicate noun under the same circumstances:

b. 1. Te és én dolgozók vagyunk.
2. You and I are workers.

while a switch from singular agreement to plural agreement is also possible in the case of predicate nouns:

c. 1. Három elvtárs olasz, ők textilmunkások.
(Bánhidi et al. 1964:435)
2. Three comrades are Italian. They are textile workers.

It might be mentioned at this point that the co-ordinating conjunction meg is often used to conjoin two entities felt to form a close-knit unit. Singular agreement seems to follow this conjunction naturally, often overriding a tendency toward pluralization under circumstances to be discussed in the next chapter:

d. 1. A disznó meg a tehén hasznos állat.
(Bánhidi et al. 1964:74)
2. The pig and the cow are useful animals.

A similar type of generic statement with és may be found with either the singular or plural predicate noun:

e. 1. A szilva és a szölő is gyümölcs(ök).
2. The plum and the grape are fruit(s).

It makes a great difference in number agreement in Hungarian when "kinds or varieties of" a particular entity are meant, as we shall see in Chapter XX.

CHAPTER XX

SEMANTIC CONSIDERATIONS OF NUMBER

20.0 Introduction

In addition to the fact that there is a great deal of difference in the way nouns marked for plurality behave syntactically in English and Hungarian, there are many differences to be found in the number interpretation of lexical items which are otherwise close equivalents in the two languages. This was already alluded to in Chapter XIX, where it was mentioned that a semantic plural is often not a grammatical plural in Hungarian. In this chapter we will concentrate our attention on semantic classes of nouns which show divergent interpretations for number in English and Hungarian.

20.1 Count-noun vs. non-count-noun

If one were to examine closely the list of grammatically singular noun phrases given in the list in 19.1.1, one might immediately presume that there is little distinction in Hungarian between count-nouns and non-count-nouns. Such a presumption is correct, for in addition to the fact that a pluralizable noun remains in the singular after a quantifier, it can be observed that the same quantifiers are used to indicate mass as well as number. In English, on the other hand, the quantifier used in a given sentence depends just as much on sentence type as noun type. It is well known that in interrogative or negative sentences the distinction between count-noun and non-count-noun in English is kept intact by the use of different quantifiers, but that in affirmative, declarative sentences the distinction is marked only by the plural morpheme on the noun. In a few instances the distinction between a singular non-count-noun and a plural count-noun is not shown, either morphologically or syntactically, in English, thereby paralleling the Hungarian pattern quite closely. We shall view these structures by comparing count-noun and non-count-noun structures in Hungarian and contrasting them with their English equivalents:

egy ház	a house	
víz	water	
sok ház	many houses	a lot of houses
sok víz	much water	a lot of water
kevés ház	few houses	a few houses
kevés víz	little water	a little water
annyi ház	so many houses	
annyi víz	so much water	
sok szarvas	many deer	a lot of deer
sok sör	much beer	a lot of beer

Thus we observe that all Hungarian nouns occur in the singular form, while English shows a plural form in the case of most count-nouns, the unmarked plural count-nouns still patterning as plurals, as we discussed in Chapter XIX.

20.1.1 Mass vs. individual object. In addition to the contrast in count-noun structures shown above, there is also a contrast in the way some objects are viewed in English and Hungarian. Examples of this phenomenon are quite numerous in the broad area of names for foodstuffs. Most foods are viewed as a mass in Hungarian, regardless whether the names belong otherwise to the count-noun category. This is coupled with the fact often mentioned previously that the generic use of a noun in Hungarian involves primarily the singular form. Thus, we can have:

	egy alma	one apple
and	sok alma	many apples

also a. 1. Almát veszek. (sg.)
2. I'm going to buy apples.

b. 1. Nem szeretem/eszem az almát. (sg.)
2. I don't like/eat apples. (*the apple)

As indicated in 1.3, however, the singular form may be used in English also in a definitional construction. An example of this was given in 19.2.2.2:

c. 1. A szilva és a szőlő is gyümölcs(ök).
2. The plum and the grape are fruit(s).

While the singular is favored in a generic sentence such as c.1 above, the plural may also be used in Hungarian if "variety of, or kind of" is meant. In English, the unqualified name may also serve this purpose, but, quite often some sort of identification is used. Thus, the following are possible:

d. 1. A jonatán jó alma.
2. The Jonathan is a good (variety of) apple.

e. 1. A jonatán és a grimes jó almák.
2. The Jonathan and the Grimes are good (varieties of) apples.

In the non-generic sense, however, Hungarian is very consistent in using the singular form, i.e., in viewing the foodstuff as a mass, while English may even use the plural form when a mass is meant. Thus, we say:

f. 1. I had a lot of beans/peas/mashed potatoes for lunch.
and not: 2. ?I had many beans/peas/mashed potatoes for lunch.

Although we can speak of two beans and two peas, and the like, we do not tend to consider the individual objects when eating them. Hungarian always tends to regard the mass of objects, as does English (inconsistently) in other instances: a lot of wheat, rice, barley, corn, etc. Here the individual object must be indicated by a counter: a grain of wheat, rice, corn, etc., with one notable exception, oats, which is a mass noun with a plural form: a lot of oats, a grain of oats, but not *one oat or *two oats. In referring to the individual object, Hungarian has the form szem 'grain,' which may also be used as a counter for por 'dust,' homok 'sand,' cukor 'sugar,' and the like.

20.1.1.1 Alternations between mass and object. In addition to the fact that some semantic classes of nouns are considered in the singular while others are considered in the plural, there are other names in English which may be used to refer to either an object or a mass (material) without a change of form. In English this is generally achieved by the use of an overt article in opposition to zero:

a. 1. There's an egg on your plate. (object)
   2. There's egg on your plate. (material)

In the case of plural objects, on the other hand, the distinction lies in the suffix since zero occurs before plural count-nouns and singular non-counts:

b. 1. We eat a lot of chicken.
   2. We raise a lot of chickens.

This makes it possible to view the same activity from different points of emphasis by the use of the contrasting suffixation:

c. 1. We eat a lot of chicken.
   2. We eat a lot of chickens.

Hungarian does not switch noun classes so readily in the case of animal names, the word hús 'meat' generally being required to designate the food from the animal. Thus, the animal may be csirke 'chicken,' for example, but the food is csirkehús 'chicken(meat).' Interlingual contrasts go even further, for in addition to the "count-mass-noun" names like chicken and egg, there are the well-known French borrowings now used for the names of the meat of some domestic animals. These food names, too, are translated into

Hungarian as compounds of hús:

	sheep	birka
	mutton	birkahús
	calf	borjú
	veal	borjúhús
	pig/hog	disznó/sertés
	pork	disznóhús/sertéshús
but	cattle (cow/ox/bull)	marha
	beef	marhahús
and	lamb	bárány
	lamb	bárányhús

There are other names of animals, however, which in English also need the addition of another word to convert them to mass-nouns:

horse	ló
horsemeat	lóhús
buffalo	bölény
buffalo-meat	bölényhús

although buffalo may be heard for the latter English word also. Alternate forms also seem possible for bear(meat) and rabbit(meat), and others. However, just as in the case of the pluralization of names of animals, we are dealing with an area of usage which is quite individualistic or even regional, and consequently cannot be pursued further in this study. The important point in all this for the student studying Hungarian is the fact that the Hungarian requires compounding regardless of how readily the English count-noun converts to a mass-noun.

20.1.2 Body parts as viewed for number. The names of body parts are worthy of separate discussion here because of the further interlingual contrast they show. Not only is the mass vs. count-noun distinction hazy, but in the case of paired body parts, the pair itself may be viewed as a unit capable of being considered by halves. In discussing body parts consisting of more than two distinguishable individual entities, Hungarian tends to favor the singular, while English requires the aggregate plural, for example:

a. 1. Jó foga van. (sg.)
   2. She has good teeth.

b. 1. A kutya lába barna. (sg.)
   2. The dog's legs are brown.

The plurals of these nouns do occur, however, in identical or similar circumstances:

c. 1. Szép fogai vannak.
   2. She has pretty teeth.

d. 1. A kutya lábai barnák.
   2. The dog's legs are brown.

This phenomenon was discussed above in the previous chapter in our considerations of pluralization of possessives.

20.1.2.1 Paired body parts. Body parts which come in pairs are not only viewed as singulars, but as single units. If, for example, one member of a given pair is missing, then one-half of the unit is gone. Therefore, we not only have singular possessives for such pairs:

a. 1. Szép szeme van. (sg.)
   2. She has beautiful eyes.

but also:

b. 1. Fél szemére vak. (lit., 'in half eye')
   2. He's blind in one eye.

c. 1. Fél lábára sánta. ('half leg')
   2. He's lame in one leg.

A person afflicted with the first defect is félszemű 'one-eyed' (lit., 'half eyed'), while one with the second is féllábú 'half legged.' However, just as we have seen in other aspects of number in Hungarian, there seems to be a diachronic change in progress, for these older forms must now compete with alternate forms which conform more to the usage of Western European languages. Thus we find *egyszemű* 'one-eyed' along side of *félszemű*, and *egylábú* 'one-legged' and so on. It might be mentioned at this point that, although my informant used the singular possessive when referring to a person's lungs, he insisted on the plural when referring to breasts:

d. 1. Egészséges *tüdeje* van. (sg.)
2. She has healthy *lungs*.

but: e. 1. Szép *mellei* vannak. (pl.)
2. She has beautiful *breasts*.

Incidentally, the *fel*- pattern does not seem to occur with either of the nouns immediately above.

20.1.3 *Appendages for paired body parts*. The *fél*- pattern is used, however, with names of clothing and other appurtenances associated with body parts occurring in pairs. Thus, *fél kesztyű* means 'half a pair of gloves' and not 'half gloves,',which is *félkesztyű*. Similarly, *fél cipő* is 'half a pair of shoes,' while *félcipő* is 'half-shoes.' Thus we can have:

a. 1. Barna *cipőt* vettem. (sg.)
2. I bought (a pair of) brown *shoes*.

b. 1. *Félcipőt* vettem.
2. *I bought* a pair of half shoes.

c. 1. Fél *cipőt* találtam. ('half a pair')
2. I found a shoe.

Since quantifiers govern the singular in Hungarian, and since there often is no distinction made between a pair and a unit, we also find: *egypár ház* 'a couple of houses' vs. *egy pár cipő* 'a pair of shoes.' Again, the use of the plural with such nouns as *cipő* 'shoe' implies "kinds of," and not simply "more than one object."

20.2 *English plurals vs. Hungarian singulars with "paired objects"*

We have noted in several places above that English generally makes more use of the plural morpheme than does Hungarian. This is true for the simple semantic reason of juxtaposition of quantifiers and nouns, or because individual objects are viewed in Hungarian while English views the aggregate. However there are two broad semantic areas where the use of the plural form in English occurs to designate a single object composed of two protruding and, more or less, bilaterally symmetrical parts.

20.2.1 "Paired" items of clothing. There are names of items of clothing in English which occur only in the plural, even though one single object may be referred to. Thus, besides a pair of shoes we may have:

a pair of shorts
a pair of panties
a pair of pajamas
a pair of suspenders
a pair of pants
a pair of bloomers
a pair of knickers
a pair of glasses
a pair of trousers
a pair of tights
a pair of plus-fours
a pair of spectacles

all of which differ from the first pattern since we can say a shoe, a sock, a garter, etc., but not *a pants or *a trousers and the like. In Hungarian, of course, the singular is used regardless of whether the "parts" of the given item are separable or not. Oddly enough, bra or brassiere--like shirt, blouse, and skirt--do not belong to the same type as panties and pants.

20.2.2 "Paired" tools in English. Just as single items of clothing may be designated with a noun in the plural, so also may the names of certain tools with two movable, bilaterally symmetrical parts be designated by a plural, the single object being likewise called "a pair of." Some of these tools are:

a pair of pliers
a pair of binoculars
a pair of tongs
a pair of snippers
a pair of scissors
a pair of field glasses
a pair of shears
a pair of calipers
a pair of goggles
a pair of pincers
a pair of clippers

As all of these are translated by singular nouns in Hungarian, they need no special mention here.

20.3 General problems of number

Perhaps the greatest difficulty for the English-speaking student in learning to master the problem of number in Hungarian is the fact that Hungarian places little emphasis on the count-noun vs. non-count-noun distinction. Learning vocabulary in context (or from the usual dictionary, for that matter) often leaves the English-speaking student without what is to him vital to know. For example, is *butor* 'furniture' pluralizable or not as it is encountered in the following example?:

a. 1. Sok *bútor* van a szobámban.
2. There is a lot of *furniture* in my room.

Upon encountering the following sentence the student learns that it indeed is pluralizable:

b. 1. A *bútorok* sárgák.
2. The *furniture* is yellow. ('*the furniture pieces*')

Slight reassurance is gained when the student finds that *bútordarab* 'piece of furniture' can also be used in the last instance. Thus, the problem of mastering the use of number in Hungarian is like all the other grammatical problems: the student needs to hear thousands of examples of speech in context before he can internalize his own rules for the native speech that he hears. It is hoped that this partial analysis may help direct the student's attention to several important places to look for these rules.

REFERENCES

Ahlgren, Arthur. 1946. *On the Use of the Definite Article with 'Nouns of Possession' in English.* (Stockholm Studies in English 2.) Uppsala, Appelberg.

Allen, Harold B. (ed.) 1964. *Readings in Applied English Linguistics.* (Second Edition) New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Annear, Sandra. 1965. "English and Mandarin Chinese: Definite and Indefinite Determiners and Modifying Structures." *Project on Linguistic Analysis No. 11*, pp. 1-55. Columbus, The Ohio State University Research Foundation.

Antal, László. 1964. "On the Possessive Forms of the Hungarian Noun." *Linguistics* 3.50-61.

Bach, Emmon W. 1965. "On Some Recurrent Types of Transformations." in Charles W. Kreidler (ed.) *Report of the Sixteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies.* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 18) Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

_____. 1967. "*Have* and *be* in English Syntax." *Lg.* 43.462-85.

Banathy, Bela, Edith Crowell Trager, and Carl D. Waddel. 1966. "The Use of Contrastive Data in Foreign Language Course Development." in Albert Valdman (ed.) *Trends in Language Teaching*, pp. 35-56. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Bánhidi, Zoltán and Zoltán Jókay. 1960. *Ungarisch über Ungarn.* Budapest, Verlag für Lehrbücher.

_____, Zoltán Jókay, and Dénes Szabó. 1965. *Learn Hungarian.* Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Barton, J. 1961. *The Application of the Article in English.* (National Physical Laboratory, Paper 32.) Teddington, Middlesex.

Báti, László and István Véges. 1966. *Angol nyelvkönyv. Tanfolyamok és magántanulók számára. I. Rész.* Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language.* New York, Henry Holt.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication." *Lingua* 18.1-34.

Bull, William E. 1963. *Time, Tense, and the Verb: A Study in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, with Particular Attention to Spanish.* (University of California Publications, Volume 19.) Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Dezső, László. 1965. "Notes on the Word Order of Simple Sentences in Hungarian." *Computational Linguistics* IV.3-59.

_____. 1967. "A magyar tárgyi bővítményes egyszerű mondatok szórendjének tipológiája." in *A magyar nyelv története es rendszere*. (Nyelvtudományi értekezések, No. 58.) Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

_____ and György Szépe. 1967. Adalélok a topic-comment problémához. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 69.365-388.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1964. "Desentential Complement Verbs in English." *Project on Linguistic Analysis No. 7*, pp. 88-105. Columbus, The Ohio State University Research Foundation.

Foder, Jerry A. and Jerrold J. Katz. (eds.) 1964. *The Structure of Language*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Francis, W. Nelson. 1958. *The Structure of American English*. New York, Ronald Press.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements." Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of Language*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Gunter, Richard. 1963. "Elliptical Sentences in American English." *Lingua* 12.137-50.

Hall, Edward T. 1959. *The Silent Language*. Greenwich, Conn., Fawcett Publications

Hall, Robert A. Jr. 1944. *Hungarian Grammar*. (Language Monograph No. 21.) Baltimore, LSA.

Hathaway, Baxter. 1967. *A Transformational Syntax: The Grammar of Modern American English*. New York, Ronald Press.

Hill, Archibald A. 1966. "A Re-examination of the English Articles." in Francis P. Dineen, S.J. (ed.) *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 19.) Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Jacobs, Roderick A. and Peter S. Rosenbaum. 1967a. *Grammar 1: Developmental Edition*. Boston, Ginn.

_____. 1967b. *Grammar 2: Developmental Edition*. Boston, Ginn.

Jesperson, Otto. 1965. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. New York, W. W. Norton and Company.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1968a. "What Do Referential Indices Refer To?" (RAND Corporation, Paper P-3854.)

_____. 1968b. "What Makes Definite Noun Phrases Definite?" (RAND Corporation, Paper P-3871.)

Katona, A. 1960. "Grammatical Difficulties of Hungarian Students Learning English." *English Language Teaching* 14.170-4.

Katz, Jerrold J. and Paul M. Postal. 1964. *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions.* Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Keresztes, Kálmán. 1965. "About the Problem of the Hungarian 'Implicative.'" *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 36.39-45.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1967. *On Emphasis and Word Order in Hungarian.* (Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series Vol. 76.) Bloomington, Indiana University.

Klagstad, Harold L. Jr. 1963. "The Opposition Definite/Non-definite in South Slavic Verb Morphology." Indiana Slavic Studies 3.35-41.

Koutsoudas, Andreas. 1966. *Writing Transformational Grammars: an Introduction.* New York, McGraw-Hill.

_____. 1968a. "The A over A Convention." Unpublished paper. Indiana University.

_____. 1968b. "On *wh*-words in English." *Journal of Linguistics* 4.267-73.

Kufner, Herbert. 1962. *Grammatical Structures of English and German.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. 1968. "English Relativization and Certain Related Problems." *Lg.* 44.244-66.

Lees, Robert B. 1960. *The Grammar of English Nominalizations.* (Publication Twelve of the Research Center for Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.) Bloomington, Indiana University.

_____. 1961. "The Constituent Structure of Noun Phrases." *American Speech* 36.159-68.

_____ and E. S. Klima. 1963. "Rules for English Pronominalization." *Lg.* 39.17-28.

Lotz, János. 1939. *Das ungarische Sprachsystem.* Stockholm, Ungarisches Institut.

Lotz, John. 1962a. "The place of the implicative (-LAK) form in the conjugational pattern of Hungarian." *MSFOu.* 125.317-327.

_____. 1962b. "Semantic Analysis of the Tenses in Hungarian." *Lingua.* 11.256-62.

A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Intézete. 1959-66. *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára, I-VII.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Martinet, André. 1962. *A Functional Theory of Language.* London, Oxford University Press.

Nida, Eugene A. 1966. *A Synopsis of English Syntax.* (Second, revised edition.) The Hague, Mouton.

Országh, László. 1960. *Angol-Magyar Szótár.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

_____. 1963. *Magyar-Angol Szótár.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Postal, Paul. 1966. "On So-called 'Pronouns' in English." in Francis P. Dineen, S.J. (ed.) *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies.* (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 19.) Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Roberts, Paul. 1954. *Understanding Grammar.* New York, Harper and Row.

Rommetveit, Ragnar. 1968. *Words, Meanings, and Messages: Theory and Experiment in Psycholinguistics.* New York, Academic Press.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. 1967. *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions.* (Research Monograph No. 47.) Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Sauvageot, Aurélien. 1951. *Esquisse de la langue hongroise.* Paris, Klincksieck.

Smith, Carlotta S. 1964. "Determiners and relative clauses in a generative grammar of English." *Lg.* 40.37-54.

Stockwell, Robert P., J. Donald Bowen, and John W. Martin. 1965. *The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish.* Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Strang, Barbara M. H. 1965. *Modern English Structure.* New York, St. Martin's Press.

Szabó, László. 1967. "Sätze mit faktitiven Verben im Ungarischen." *Lingua* 17.410-20.

Tompa, József. (ed.) 1961. *A mai magyar nyelv rendszere. Leíró nyelvtan I.* Budapest, Aakadémiai Kiadó.

_____. (ed.) 1962. *A mai magyar nyelv rendszere. Leíró nyelvtan II.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

_____. 1968. *Ungarische Grammatik.* Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Springfield, Mass., G. and C. Merriam Company.

Zsilka, János. 1967. *The System of Hungarian Sentence Patterns.* (Indiana University Publications. Volume 67 of the Uralic and Altaic Series.) Bloomington, Indiana University.